BR
65
B236
M3
GTU

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/stmochtabachiari00unse

St. Mochta and Bachiarius

BY

REV. M. H. MacINERNY, O.P.,

Member of the National Academy of Ireland,
Fellow of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland.

[*Reprinted from "The Irish Ecclesiastical Record," 1923*]

Property of
COSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LIMITED
DUBLIN . BELFAST . CORK . WATERFORD

BR
65
B236
M3

ST. MOCHTA AND BACHIARIUS

I

THE life-story of St. Mochta brings us at once within the Patrician circle, introduces us to a famous literary discussion, and leads us to the roots of the Athanasian Creed. A disciple of St. Patrick and a Briton by birth, St. Mochta was a trusted colleague and helper of our National Apostle; he became first Bishop of Louth and founder of a once-famous abbey in that historic region. He was, indeed, one of the most venerable figures in the early Irish Church. Venerable alike for his great age, for his gifts of prophecy and miracles, for his uncommon austerity of life, and for the vast number of ecclesiastics who were trained in learning and holiness under his direction, St. Mochta was regarded by writers of a later time with special esteem and veneration. For instance, in his *Life of St. Columba*—'the most precious relic left us in the whole range of hagiology during the Middle Ages'[1]—Adamnan thus writes of Mochta's prophecy regarding the future Saint of Iona and Apostle of the Picts:—

> Not only from the days of his infancy did our prelate, by the favour of Heaven, deserve to be honoured by the name [of Columba], but even many long years before his birth, it was given to him as a child of promise, in a miraculous prophecy of a soldier of Christ, to whom it was revealed by the Holy Ghost. For Maucteus [Mochta], a pilgrim from Britain, a holy man, a disciple of St. Patrick the Bishop, gave the following prophecy of our Patron, as I have been informed on the testimony of learned ancients: 'In the last ages of the world,' he said, 'a son shall be born, whose name, Columba, shall be announced in every province of the Isles of the ocean; and brilliantly shall he enlighten the last ages of the world. The boundary of one narrow hedge shall divide the little farms of his monastery and mine,—a man most dear to God, and of great merit in His sight.'[2]

[1] Dr. M'Carthy's Preface to his translation of *Life of St. Columba.*

[2] Adamnan's *Life of St. Columba,* translated by Dr. Daniel M'Carthy, Bishop of Kerry (Dublin, Duffy), pp. 3, 4. Bishop M'Carthy and Canon O'Hanlon

acc: 4701

The various incidents of St. Mochta's life cannot be discussed in this paper, though they well deserve, and would amply repay, a critical examination. The only formal biography of the Saint, so far as I am aware, is the Latin Life in the *Codex Salmanticensis*. This Codex is, in the main, a volume of Latin Lives of Irish saints, copied from older (in some cases very much older) documents by a fourteenth-century scribe. Preserved at the Irish College of Salamanca in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, the Codex was presented by Father Thomas Brehon, S.J., Rector of the College (1613–1631), to a Belgian colleague, who gave it to Father Rosweyd, S.J. (died 1629), the illustrious founder of the Bollandists; and it is now preserved in the Royal Library of Brussels.

Father John Colgan, the great Franciscan scholar of Louvain, made considerable use of this Codex in his *Acta SS. Hiberniae* (Louvain, 1645), where he printed the Life of St. Mochta of Louth (p. 729 ff.) for the first time. This Life was reprinted with annotations, borrowed mainly from Colgan, by the Bollandist Father Pinius (Pien), in 1737.[1] The entire Codex was published in a splendid edition, by the Bollandist Fathers De Smedt and De Backer, in 1887, thanks to the munificence of the Marquis of Bute.[2] This noble work does not seem to have attracted, in Ireland, anything like the attention it deserved.

The Life of an Irish saint is generally a chaplet of miracles, and St. Mochta's biography, like Adamnan's *Life of St. Columba*, is no exception to the rule. Still, St. Mochta's Life is written in a sober, matter-of-fact tone, and we cannot help suspecting that it may be the work of a rather early writer. Without artifice or design, it brings vividly before us a state of society in which paganism,

failed to notice Reeves' self-correction (cf. Reeves' *Adamnan*, p. 7 with pp. 461, 462). St. Columba had a monastery at Ardpatrick, about a mile from Louth, and the lands of the two monasteries adjoined. Columba (521-597) was a boy of fourteen when Mochta died.

[1] *Acta SS.*, Aug. iii. 736-747 (Paris edit. of 1867).

[2] *Acta SS. Hiberniae* ex codice Salmanticensi, nunc primum edita a Carolo De Smedt et Jos. De Backer hagiographis Bollandianis. Edinburgi [Blackwood], 1887. The Life of St. Mochta is in cols. 903-914.

though losing ground, is still strong in certain quarters, and Christianity, though advancing, is still far from victorious. It is a condition of society such as we might expect to find in Ireland about A.D. 450.

Pagans and Christians are members of the same family. The young Mochta and his mother, though apparently Christians, are members of the household of a distinguished druid, who is a relative of theirs. Individual conversions from paganism are brought about by the example and instructions of individual Christians. When Mochta founded his first little monastery at Kilmore, 'in the woods of Omeath,' he is driven away by the country folk, who are presumably pagans. Louth is a stronghold of druidism. A young Christian girl dies, and her pagan relatives celebrate her funeral rites for seven days, in accordance with pagan custom. Mochta abolishes pagan rites, founds many monasteries, converts and baptizes a great number of idolaters : *gens idololatra, sacro fonte sanctificata, fit Christicola.*

These pagan threads run through the warp and woof of Mochta's life-story, and it would have been very difficult for a later writer to insert them so naturally and so artlessly. Besides, the familiar way in which the writer of Mochta's life uses the ancient names of districts now comprised in the counties of Louth and Monaghan, suggests that he is by no means a late writer. Again, as Father Edmund Hogan has remarked, 'the forms of Irish proper names are very old and pure' in the *Codex Salmanticensis*, from which this Life of St. Mochta is taken.[1] It would probably be rash to affirm, with Colgan,[2] that the Life was written before A.D. 600 ; but we can readily agree with what he says in praise of its Latin style.

On the whole, therefore, in spite of some gross blemishes, which may be due to interpolation, we may regard

[1] *Onomasticon Goedelicum*, by E. Hogan, S.J., p. xii.

[2] 'Eiusque author, licet elegantioris et expeditioris styli, quam alii plerique istius aevi scriptores, videtur floruisse ante saeculi sexti finem, ut ipse subindicat c. 20, adducens testimonium S. Dagaei quasi tunc viventis.'—*Acta SS. Hib.*, 731. The biographer speaks of Bishop Ibar and St. Daigh as if both were still alive.

this Life of the great Saint of Louth, as fairly ancient and reliable. It seems to deserve more sympathetic study, and less harsh and off-hand condemnation, than it received in the eighteenth century from the Bollandist Pinius, and in the nineteenth from a Scotch Presbyterian minister,[1] and even from such notable Irish scholars as Lanigan and O'Hanlon. Anyone who wishes to make a critical but sympathetic study of the Saint's career must naturally take account of various other data, which help to fill up the meagre outline given in the *Vita Moctei.*[2]

All authorities agree in affirming that St. Mochta lived to extreme old age. The Annals ascribe his death to the year 534 (*rectius* 535 or 537). We need not concern ourselves with the writers who, by a corrupt following of a corrupt text, declared that he was 300 years old when he died. Colgan and common sense show that to be absurd. Nobody pretends that Moctha was alive before A.D. 400 or after A.D. 537. The true version is given in a well-known poem on the Saints of Ireland, which was long ascribed to St. Cuimine of Connor (*d.* 658), but which Whitley Stokes regards, on linguistic grounds, as written in the eleventh or twelfth century.[3] This poem tells us that

[1] *Dict. of Christian Biography*, iii. 928, art. 'Mochta,' by Rev. J. Gammack.

[2] Further particulars regarding St. Mochta in Life of St. Daigh, *Acta SS.*, Aug. iii. 659 ; *Acta SS. Hiberniae*, ed. De Smedt and De Backer, 845, 891-893 ; Todd, *Obits and Martyrology of Christ Church*, lxix. ; O'Grady's *Silva Gadelica*, i. 25, 33-35, ii. 31, 460 ; Whitley Stokes, *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*, 226, 264, 266, 498, 574 ; Whitley Stokes, *Lives of Irish Saints from Book of Lismore*, 164 ; Whitley Stokes, *Three Middle-Irish Homilies*, 99 ; Joyce, *Social Hist. of Ireland*, ii. 156 ; and T.C.D. MS. 1298, p. 248 ; besides the usual Annals, Calendars, and Martyrologies. Needless to add, Colgan's *Acta SS. Hib.*, p. 729 ff., and his *Trias Thaum.*, 94, 95, 162, 167, as well as Canon O'Hanlon's *Lives of Irish Saints*, Aug. 19, should also be consulted.

[3] *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, i. (1897), 62, 63, ; cf. i. 66, 67. Still, linguistic evidence is not always a sure criterion of age. Scribes were apt to modernize the language of the text they were copying. As Dr. Plummer observes : 'The Irish scribe was seldom content to be a mere copyist, but aspired to the more ambitious rôle of an editor' ; and he instances two Irish Lives in which 'one or both of the scribes must have taken considerable liberties with the originals : . . . the two recensions often differ considerably, not only in vocabulary and phraseology, but also in such matters as expansion or abbreviation, insertion, or omission' (Plummer, *Bethada Naem nErenn*, 1922, vol. i. p. xiii.). Dr. Stokes is emphatic on the necessity of 'remembering always that late documents may embody early records' (*Tripar.*, Intro., cxxix.)

Mochta led a most abstemious life for the space of a hundred years,—that is, as we may reasonably assume, from his early adoption of the monastic life until his death. The verses which embody the grotesque 300-years legend are of later date, as Colgan and Whitley Stokes have pointed out; and Colgan has shown how easily the corrupt reading may have slipped into the text of these verses.

Mr. Alfred Anscombe—whose charming little essays often shed valuable light on points of history or chronology, though he sometimes falls into quite alarming mistakes—has ingeniously striven to show that St. Mochta died in 484.[1] But the acceptance of this date would only land us in fresh perplexities. For instance, if St. Mochta lived 120 years, he would have been born in 364, ten years earlier than St. Patrick, whose disciple he was. Besides, Mr. Anscombe's key has not yet unlocked the numerous other problems of abnormal longevity which we find among Irish Saints. For the present, therefore, we may safely regard the tradition of St. Mochta's death in 534 (535) as unshaken. The chronology of his life is another matter.

A brief summary of the salient events of Mochta's life may help us to guess at the chronology. Born in Britain, he was brought as a child (*infans*) to Ireland by his mother, in the suite of a renowned druid named Hoam, to whose family they belonged. The party fixed their residence on Mag Conaille, and Mochta grew up in the druid's household. As he sat one day in a field, an angel appeared, gave him a wax writing tablet, taught him the rudiments of letters (*litterarum elementa*), and bade him go to Rome for the study of Scripture. We next hear of him in Rome, where he devotes himself to study. In course of time he becomes eminent for learning and piety; disciples gather round him. The Pope consecrates him Bishop, and sends him back to Ireland with twelve companions. His first monastic foundation is at Kilmore-Edan, which is called after one of his disciples, and is now in the barony of Monaghan. Thence he is driven out, and afterwards settles in Louth, where he

[1] *Ériu*, v. 4.

establishes a splendid monastery. Here he has frequent conferences with St. Patrick, at a spot called Lecc Mhochta, about midway between Ardpatrick and Louth. Mochta shares St. Patrick's fast on Croagh Patrick; founds many other monasteries; writes a Rule for his monks; and has a multitude of distinguished disciples in the course of his long career. He vainly begs the life of a condemned robber from the 'wicked' king, Ailell Molt, who fell in the battle of Ocha, 482 (483). He declines a gift of certain lands near Ardpatrick, offered by the prince of Oriel and Orior, Aedh, son of Colcu, as they were divinely destined for the future St. Columba.

The record of this last transaction seems tainted by a grave anachronism, which I may venture to discuss here, in the hope that somebody may discover a solution of the enigma. Mochta's prophecy was clearly fulfilled, for St. Columba's monks afterwards had a monastery and lands at Ardpatrick. The anachronism lies in the fact that Prince Aedh mac Colgan could not, in his official capacity, have offered the lands to Mochta: he was too young to be the reigning prince in 535. He died a holy death as a monk at Clonmacnois in 606, seventy-one years after Mochta's own demise. Still, Aedh may have been a young man of twenty in the closing year of Mochta's life; and he may have induced his predecessor to offer the lands to the holy Bishop-Abbot of Louth. This would explain the loose expression of the biographer, who implied and assumed contemporary knowledge.

Unfortunately, this theory does not harmonize with the prophecy as related by the biographer: 'In the northern part of Ireland, a Saint will be born. His name will be Columba, the elect and beloved of God. To him have these lands been given by God; and Britain as well as Ireland shall serve him.' [1] This prophecy purports to have been uttered before St. Columba's birth, that is, in or before the year 521. Now Aedh could not possibly have been the reigning prince of Oriel in 520, seeing that he

[1] *Acta SS.*, Aug. iii. 745.

died in 606. We cannot suppose that the prophecy was made in the last year of Mochta's life (535), for Columba was a boy of fourteen at the time. In fact, a Life of Columba in the *Codex Salmanticensis* declares that Mochta foretold the coming of Columba, 'sixty years before the event,' [1] thus fixing A.D. 461 as the date of the prophecy. To suppose that Aedh mac Colgan, the pious prince of Oriel, was reigning in 461, and that he survived until 606 (145 years later) is outside the pale of possibility.

Perhaps the genealogies may show that Aedh mac Colgan's predecessor in Oriel was a prince of the same name. If that were so, the anachronism would vanish. Perhaps Mochta more than once uttered his prophecy of Columba's coming: he may have done so in 461, and again in 535. In this case also, the anachronism would be more apparent than real; but the biographer would have given an incorrect report of Mochta's words. Finally, this short paragraph in Mochta's Life may be a later interpolation.

Writers of Irish Saints' Lives pay little heed to chronology—a practice for which they could plead high authority. In the present case, as a pure piece of guess-work, but keeping very closely to facts and probabilities, let us try to construct the chronology of Mochta's life. We may assume, with the Bollandists, that he was 120 years old when he died. This is by no means an impossible age, even at the present day; a relative of my own died a few years ago at the age of 114.[2] We cannot well assume a shorter

[1] *Acta SS. Hib.*, ed. De Smedt and De Backer, 845.

[2] Some of the Fathers in the Desert are said to have reached an immense age, St. Paul of Thebes 113, and St. Anthony 105 years, respectively. From a recent newspaper, I condense the following: William Kennedy, of Holden, Alberta, who died at the authenticated age of 125, shaved himself to within two weeks of his death, and could read without glasses. An official of the Alberta Bureau of Vital Statistics, writing to the *Lancet*, states that Kennedy's death was caused by 'senility,' a contributory cause being 'exhaustion.' There is a Red Indian called Wrinkled Meat, commonly known as John Smith, living in the North-west of America, whose age was stated in 1921 to be 134. Jan Krasinski, a Pole, who claims to be the sole survivor of Napoleon's armies, returned to Poland last year to 'settle down' at the age of 132. Djouro Chemdine, a Constantinople Turk, was said to be 146 when he visited Paris

life-span than six score years in Mochta's case, unless we are prepared to do violence to the evidence.

If St. Mochta was 120 years old in 535, he was born in 415, and would seem to have been brought by his mother to Ireland in that year. Supposing that he was a boy of seven when the angel taught him the rudiments of letters: this would bring us to 422. In 432, when St. Patrick came, Mochta was a youth of 17. We can easily imagine his coming, in a short time, under the great Apostle's influence, especially as the plain of Bregia, adjoining that of Conaille Muirthemne, where Mochta lived, was one of the first districts evangelized by St. Patrick.[1]

It is not unreasonable to suppose that Mochta became a monk in 435, at the age of 20, and thus began his long career of abstinence. After five years of monastic life, he is sent to Rome in 440, at the age of 25, to pursue his studies. St. Leo the Great is Pope, 440–461. After ten years in Rome, Mochta is a young monk of great promise, conspicuous for ability, devotion, and zeal; he is raised to the episcopate in 450, at the age of 35, and sent, with the Pope's blessing, to help in Christianizing his own people.[2] Reaching Ireland in 450, he founds his monasteries of Kilmore and Louth in the next few years; comes again into close touch with St. Patrick, whose labours he shares during a decade of years or so, until the Apostle's death in 461,[3] when Mochta was 46 years old. Thereafter he pursues his beneficent career, founding monasteries, training

in search of a job, little more than a year ago (*Freeman's Journal*, Jan. 27, 1923). Whatever we may think of these pressmen's tales, it can scarcely be denied that some rare human beings manage to reach the age of six score, even in our own time. The relatively modern cases of Old Parr and the Old Countess of Desmond are well known.

[1] W. Stokes, *Tripartite*, cxlii.: 'Patrick then proceeded actively in the conversion of Bregia and other parts of the territory of the Southern Húi Neill.'

[2] If Prof. Bury is right in dating St. Patrick's visit to Rome *circa* 441-443 (*Life of St. Patrick*, 150-154), there is nothing unreasonable in supposing that Mochta (like Sachall) accompanied him, and remained to study. His known connexion with the great Apostle of Ireland would be an additional and potent reason for his elevation to the episcopate.

[3] To this year belongs Mochta's prophecy of Columba's coming, sixty years before the event (*Acta SS. Hib.*, ed. De Smedt and De Backer, 845).

monks and priests, converting those who still remained in heathendom, performing miracles and uttering prophecies, according as God inspired him, and finally closing his earthly career at the extremely advanced age of 120, in A.D. 535. He received the Last Sacraments from St. Daigh, the skilled artist in silver work, who likewise lived to a ripe old age, and died in 586. In this tentative chronology, so far as I am aware, there is nothing impossible, nothing glaringly improbable.

But there is another question, on which St. Mochta has unwittingly set the learned world by the ears for two centuries or more, and which is likely to prove a bone of contention among critics for some time to come. The question is, whether a certain ancient and interesting Profession of Faith should be ascribed to the Irish Saint, or to a mysterious Bachiarius, of whom extremely little is known.

A long array of writers, of varying degrees of eminence, may be cited on either side. The critics on one side, as a rule, are blissfully unaware of the arguments adduced by upholders of the rival theory. Indeed, the view which favours the authorship of Bachiarius has assumed so many distinct and contradictory forms that we can hardly regard it as a single theory : it is properly a group of theories.

The Confession of Faith is claimed for St. Mochta chiefly by writers of the old-fashioned and less critical school ; by Bale, Harpsfeld, Pits, Oudin, Gesner, and Aubertus Miræus, followed by Moran, Greith, Bellesheim, and O'Hanlon.[1] The older members of this school were dominated by Bale ; and

[1] See Bale, *Scriptorum Illustrium Majoris Brytanniae Catalogus*, Basle, 1557-1559, pp. 44-45 ; Nicholas Harpsfeld, *Histor. Ecclesiasticae Anglicanae*, 1622, p. 35 ; Pits, *Relationum Historicarum de Rebus Anglicis*, commonly cited as *De Illustribus Britanniae Scriptoribus*, Paris, 1623, pp. 88-89 ; Oudin, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* (1722), i. 1174-76 ; Gesner, or rather the editors of his *Bibliotheca* (1583), pp. 98, 559 ; Aubertus Miræus, *De Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* in Auctario, pp. 50, 59, 189 ; Moran, *Essays on Early Irish Church*, Dublin, 1864, pp. 94, 241, 296-303 ; Greith, *Geschichte der altirischen Kirche*, 1867, pp. 408-416 ; Bellesheim, *Geschichte der Kath. Kirche in Irland*, 1890, vol. i. pp. 79, 80 ; O'Hanlon, *Lives of Irish Saints*, Aug. 19.

it is abundantly clear that Bishop Greith, Canon Bellesheim, and Canon O'Hanlon drew their inspiration from Dr. (afterwards Cardinal) Moran.

Colgan, writing in 1645, is frankly sceptical as to Mochta's authorship of the Confession of Faith and certain other writings.[1] This is not surprising, for, as Colgan well knew, Mochta's claims had been expressly denied by Ussher and Ware, half a dozen years earlier. Had Colgan ascribed these writings to the holy Bishop of Louth, a valid excuse might readily be found for him. He could appeal to the authority of leading historians of Christian literature for well-nigh a hundred years, who unhesitatingly identified St. Mochta with Bachiarius. Besides, Colgan was engaged in pioneer work, 'blazing the trail' through a virgin forest of Saints' Lives, and comparing them with Annals, Calendars, Martyrologies, and so on. In such work, mistakes are inevitable. But the truth is that Colgan was a man of far more critical mind than certain others who lived in a later and more critical age.

That St. Mochta was a totally different personage from Bachiarius, and that the Confession of Faith belongs to the latter and not to the former, is emphatically the view of Ussher, Ware, Tanner, Muratori, Gallandi, the Bollandists, Mangenot, Pederson, Gougaud, Fritzsche, Künstle, and Burn.[2] Indeed, it may be said at once that the trend of modern scholarship is decisively against the theory of St. Mochta's authorship, though two or three serious

[1] 'Unde placuit sub dubio inter ejus [scil. Moctei] opera connumerare, quae Bacchiario sive Bacchiano, quae Macceo Mocteo, vel uni sub utroque nomine attribuuntur.'—Colgan, *Acta SS. Hib.*, 735.

[2] Ussher, *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates*, first published in 1639, second edit. 1687, p. 445; Ware, *De Scriptoribus Hiberniae*, 1639, pp. 105-106; Tanner, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, 1748, p. 529; Muratori, *Analecta Ambrosiana*, vol. ii. (1698), pp. 1-24; Gallandi, *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum* (1765-1781), vol. ix. pp. 181-202; his text of this Confession of Faith is reprinted in Migne, *P.L.*, xx. 1019-1036; *Acta Sanctorum*, Aug. iii. 743 (1867 edit.); Mangenot in *Dict. de Théologie Cath.*, iii. 6; Pederson, in *Cath. Encyclop.*, art. 'Bachiarius'; Gougaud, *Les Chrétientés Celtiques*, 281, 282; Fritzsche, in *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, xvii. (1896-97), 211-215; Künstle, *Antipriscilliana* (1905), pp. 46, 163-167; Burn, *The Athanasian Creed*, 1896, p. lxxv.

difficulties, which militate against the modern view, are over-looked rather than solved.

The Confession of Faith which has given rise to this wide divergence of opinion, was first published by Muratori in 1698, from an ancient Irish codex of the Ambrosian Library of Milan, though it had been known, mostly by hearsay, for 1200 years before. In 1748, a new and carefully revised edition, based on the Ambrosian manuscript and enriched with critical dissertations, was brought out by Florio in Rome. This edition was highly esteemed by the learned Oratorian, Gallandi, who published the Confession once more, accompanied by Muratori's elaborate notes, to which Gallandi added some erudite comments of his own, with corrections based on the Florian recension. Gallandi's edition was reprinted, as it stood, by Migne, in the 20th volume of his *Patrologia Latina* in 1845. Again, in 1864, another edition of this much-discussed document was given to the world by Cardinal (then Dr.) Moran, who professed to have corrected it by the aid of the Ambrosian manuscript.[1] His text, on the whole, is distinctly better than Muratori's; but his readings in some few cases, are less exact than those of Gallandi and Migne. Finally, the Confession was republished by Hahn in his *Bibliothek der Symbole*, which appeared in a third edition at Breslau, in 1897.

Only one ancient manuscript of this Confession of Faith is known to exist. It was discovered by Muratori in the Ambrosian Library of Milan, whither it had been brought from the famous abbey of Bobbio. Muratori, one of the very greatest scholars of his age, declared with emphasis that the manuscript was, at the very least, over a thousand years old.[2] This would mean that it was written at some time prior to 698. The learned Maurist, Montfaucon,

[1] *Essays on Early Irish Church*, 241 n.

[2] 'Opusculum hoc mihi depromptum est ex antiquissimo Ambrosianae Codice, quem ante annos minimum mille conscriptum, characterum forma non dubitanter testatur. Fuit autem olim celebris Monasterii Bobiensis, et ex illo in Ambrosianam translatus a magno Card. Federico Borromeo.'—*Anecd. Ambr.*, ii. 8.

shortly afterwards ascribed it to the eighth century, that is, to some date between A.D. 700 and A.D. 800. This manuscript, therefore, cannot have been the original autograph; for the autograph, or a copy, was known to Gennadius of Marseilles in A.D. 480.

This Irish manuscript of the Ambrosian Library possesses a double distinction. It contains the only known copy of this Confession of Faith (now commonly cited as the *Fides Bachiarii*, or the Faith of Bachiarius) and the oldest copy (or one of the two oldest copies) of the Athanasian Creed. Dr. Burn, an English scholar, whose writings have earned high praise from German experts, thus describes this Irish Codex :—

> This MS. came to the Ambrosian Library at Milan from the Monastery of Bobbio. It is a thin quarto volume of 18 folios, 10 in. by 7½ in. It is written in an Irish hand, to be compared with the script of the Antiphonary of Bangor. In the opinion of Dr. Ceriani, the Librarian, both MSS. were probably written about the same time, i.e., the end of the seventh century. Dr. Traube does not say more than seventh or eighth century,[1] but I think that anyone who has carefully examined the MS., without prepossessions, will be well content to leave the date ± 700. In either case, it supplies a link to connect the later eighth-century MSS. of the [Athanasian] Creed with the seventh-century quotations.
>
> The MS. contains—
>
> (i.) The Book of Ecclesiastical Dogmas, written by Gennadius;
> (ii.) the Faith of Bachiarius, with a short prayer;
> (iii.) the *Quicumque* without title;
> (iv.) A Sermon on the Ascension;
> (v.) (in a slightly later eighth-century hand) the Creed of Damasus under the title of 'The Faith of Jerome.' [2]

A parallel passage from an earlier work by this distinguished scholar is also worth quoting :—

> The most important early MS. of the [Athanasian] Creed is in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, O.212 *sup.* It comes from the monastery of Bobbio, and according to Montfaucon is written in Lombardic characters. Dr. Ceriani assigns it confidently to the eighth century, and thinks that it was written in Ireland or England.[3] It contains the 'Book

[1] *Perrona Scottorum*, p. 500.

[2] Dr. A. E. Burn, *Facsimiles of the Creeds*, 1909, p. 22. Cf. *The Athanasian Creed*, by the same writer, 1912, pp. 105-106.

[3] See J. W. Burgon, in the *Guardian*, of February 3, 1873.

of Ecclesiastical Dogmas,' which has been ascribed to Gennadius; the 'Faith of Bachiarius,' followed by a short prayer; and the *Quicumque* without a title (a mark of early date); then a sermon on the Ascension, and 'The Faith of Jerome.' [1]

This Irish Codex, therefore, contains the only early MS. of the Faith of Bachiarius, and the most important early MS. of the Athanasian Creed. Its antiquity is becoming more and more evident to scholars, as we may infer from a comparison of Dr. Burn's earlier passage with his later. Bishop Greith was sadly mistaken in devoting eleven pages of his work to the 'Irish *Liber Dogmatum*,' [2] which now turns out to be merely the *Dogmata Ecclesiastica* of Gennadius.

In a further article or two, I hope to sketch the reasons which led some Irish and Continental writers to ascribe the Faith of Bachiarius to St. Mochta; after which I shall endeavour to establish the following conclusions :—

I. The early Irish authorities on St. Mochta make no mention whatever of his having written a Confession of Faith.

II. The earliest ascription of this Confession of Faith to Bachiarius occurs in Gennadius of Marseilles, who wrote *circa* A.D. 480.

III. The earliest identification of St. Mochta with Bachiarius occurs in Bale, the Protestant Bishop of Ossory, who wrote in the mid-sixteenth century.

IV. There is much diversity of opinion, in regard to Bachiarius, among the modern scholars who have no hesitation in accepting his authorship of the Confession of Faith; and these scholars ignore certain grave difficulties.

[1] Dr. A. E. Burn, *The Athanasian Creed*, 1896, p. xx.

[2] *Gesch. der altirischen Kirche*, 416-427. Künstle doubts its Gennadian paternity, but assigns it confidently to some Anti-priscillianist writer of Southern Gaul in the fifth century (*Antipriscilliana*, 192).

II

MANY worthy scholars, foreigners as well as Irishmen, regarded St. Mochta as the author of that Confession of Faith which is now commonly known as the Faith of Bachiarius. Theirs was, indeed, a seductive theory, a theory that haunts one's mind even at the present day, and that one relinquishes with regret. It had the merit of seeming to harmonize admirably—much better than any rival theory—with most of the known facts of the case.

In the first place, it harmonized with tradition. From the invention of printing down to the first quarter of the eighteenth century, the history of Christian literature had been diligently studied by many writers of great name; and in most of their standard works, St. Mochta had been identified with Bachiarius, as author of the *Opusculum de fide*. The verdicts of Bale and Harpsfeld and that of Gesner's editors, in the sixteenth century, followed by those of Pits and Aubertus Miræus in the early seventeenth century, and by Oudin in 1722, seemed fairly decisive. True, there had been discordant voices. There were Ussher and Ware, who flatly denied St. Mochta's authorship, in 1639; and there was Colgan's scepticism, frankly expressed in 1645. But the most powerful and authorized of the dissentient voices was that of Muratori, who first published the text of the Confession of Faith in 1698, and ascribed it simply to Bachiarius, who had flourished about the year 390, and had written against Helvidius and Jovinian.

Colgan, like his predecessors, had never seen the text of the Confession of Faith; but he suggested that the name of Bachiarius might be a scribal misreading of one of the Latin forms of St. Mochta's name. Colgan's suggestion

was eagerly seized upon, and regarded as a 'proof,' [1] by Dr. Moran, then a young man of thirty-four, and Vice-Rector of the Irish College in Rome. Dr. Moran's book was a remarkable production for so young a writer; it influenced grave and reverend scholars like Greith in Switzerland, Bellesheim in Germany, and O'Hanlon in Ireland.

But the case for Mochta's authorship of the Faith of Bachiarius rested on broader and firmer grounds than a dubious tradition and a possible misreading. The document itself seemed to attest its Irish origin. The only known manuscript of this Confession of Faith had come from the renowned Irish monastery of Bobbio, and was almost certainly written within a century after the time of St. Columbanus, who died in 615. Dr. Ceriani, a recent Librarian of the Ambrosian, believed it to have been written in Ireland or England; Dr. Burn, an expert authority, holds that it was written in Bobbio. In any case, it was written in an Irish hand, not unlike the script of the Antiphonary of Bangor—that 'golden fragment of our ancient Irish Liturgy,' as Dr. Moran aptly described it—which is also treasured in the Ambrosian Library. The two codices were apparently coeval; the Antiphonary of Bangor dating from 680–691, and the Faith of Bachiarius, with its companion piece, the most important early copy of the Athanasian Creed, being written about the same time or a little later.

The Irish origin and associations of the Bachiarius manuscript being thus ascertained, it was easy and natural to assume that its author, no less than its copyist, was an Irishman. Certain peculiarities of diction seemed to confirm this view. Most people are aware of the extreme frequency with which *eadhon* or *.i.*, the Irish equivalents of 'hoc est' or 'id est,' are found in certain Irish writings. Now, the author of the Bachiarius tract is very fond of

[1] 'This valuable treatise was first published by Muratori, in the second volume of his *Analecta*, under the name of Bachiarius; which, as Colgan proves, was nothing more than a corruption of the Irish name of our saint' (Moran, *Essays on Early Irish Church*, 296).

'hoc est' or 'id est,' using these phrases at least eleven times in eight paragraphs, as for example:

'Si pro culpa unius, totius provinciæ anathemanda generatio est, damnetur et illa beatissima discipula, *hoc est*, Roma, de qua nunc non una, sed duæ vel tres, aut eo amplius hæreses pullularunt; et tamen nulla earum cathedram Petri, *hoc est*, sedem Fidei, aut tenere potuit aut movere.'[1]

This brings us to one of the strongest arguments for the Irish authorship of the Confession of Faith. Its author devotes a full quarter of his tract to an indignant, and even passionate, protest against the unfairness of certain personages in high places (*præsidentium quorumdam*), who suspected himself and his countrymen of some unnamed heresy. He warmly denounces the injustice of misjudging a whole nation for the sin of one man, and neatly turns the tables on his accusers by pointing out that their unfair principle would condemn the Apostles for the sin of Judas. It would also, he reminds them, condemn Rome itself, 'that most blessed pupil' of the Apostles, because various heresies had been disseminated from the Eternal City (by Marcion, Valentinian, Novatian, Helvidius, Jovinian, etc.); 'and yet none of their false doctrines had been able to lay hold upon, or to move, the Chair of Peter, which is the Seat of Faith.'

Convinced of St. Mochta's authorship, Cardinal Moran states the case as follows:—

St. Mochta more than once refers to the fact of *one individual* having given the evil fame of heresy to our country; and thus he gives us a key to the statements of early writers concerning the faith of our island in the fifth century. On the one hand, we know that no heresy infected the Irish Church; whilst, on the other hand, many ancient writers unite Ireland with England when treating of the spread of Pelagianism. Thus, the letter of the Roman clergy, written in 639, speaks of the *Pelagianæ hæreseos virus*, as if it had, in a preceding age, infected Ireland.[2] The

[1] Migne, *P.L.*, xx. 1023. Gallandi thinks that some word has been omitted after 'beatissima,' and suggests 'beatissima Petri discipula' as a likelier reading. St. Leo the Great calls Rome the 'discipula veritatis.'

[2] On the contrary, the letter speaks of Pelagianism as having been recently revived in Ireland: 'Et hoc quoque cognovimus, quod virus Pelagianæ hæreseos apud vos denuo reviviscit; quod omnino hortamur, ut a vestris mentibus hujusmodi venenatum superstitionis facinus auferatur' (Ussher, *Sylloge*, 1632,

tract on the liturgy, published in our second Appendix, also eulogizes St. Germanus for having expelled Pelagianism 'from Britain and Ireland'; [1] and similar phrases are met with in many other writers. Thus, what was the guilt of one individual, Celestius,[2] was imputed to his country; and hence the evil fame of heresy was for a time attached to our sainted island. St. Mochta, in his Profession of Faith, alludes to no heresy[3]; he had none to abjure; he and his countrymen had retained untainted and unchanged the profession of faith which they had made at the baptismal font; and hence, in the present treatise, we have little more than a running commentary on the Apostles' Creed, whilst he especially dwells on those precise points of doctrine which are characteristic of the early Irish writers.[4]

Despite the inaccuracies of the foregoing statement, Cardinal Moran has put his finger on a point which has been persistently overlooked by recent scholars. Bachiarius, whoever he may be, declares that his country is misjudged *on account of one man*; and his impassioned argument, through the first quarter of his treatise, is directed against the injustice of this proceeding. He generally describes his country as his *Patria* or his *Provincia*; sometimes, but more rarely, he refers to it as his *regio* or *solum nostrum originale.*

p. 23). Pope John IV and his colleagues were misinformed. Even so unfriendly a critic as Dom Gougaud admits that these charges and suspicions of Pelagianism were unfounded, so far as Ireland was concerned (*Chrétientés Celtiques*, 283, 284, 378).

[1] 'Germanus et Lupus, episcopi, Pelagianam hæresim vel Gallianam . . . ex Britanniis et Scotiis provinciis expulerunt' (Moran, *Essays on Early Irish Church*, 244). This tract dates from the eighth century, not from 680. See Gougaud, 299.

[2] *Recte*, Pelagius. Recent German scholars regard Celestius as an Italian. See articles on Pelagianism, by Dr. Pohle in *Cath. Encyclop.* and Dr. W. Koch in *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, 1912, ii. 1392. Pelagius was expressly described as a Briton by St. Augustine, St. Prosper of Aquitaine, Paul Orosius, and Marius Mercator—four contemporary witnesses of unimpeachable authority; but St. Jerome, who never had a good word for the Irish, professed to regard him as of Irish descent, whether proximately or remotely. Vallarsi, St. Jerome's editor in Migne, thinks that St. Jerome meant that Pelagius was descended from the Scots who were settled in the south of Caledonia, adjoining England. Vallarsi is probably right. A ridiculous French Radical, named M. de Kerguézec, senator of the Côtes-du-Nord and mayor of Tréguier, has lately been glorifying Pelagius as an illustrious Breton!—See *Les Lettres*, May, 1923, p. 742.

[3] This is incorrect. The author of the Confession of Faith makes express allusion to the heresies of Novatian and Helvidius; and he combats the errors of Jovinian and Priscillian, without naming their authors, as we shall see.

[4] Moran, *Essays on Early Irish Church*, 297.

Whatever heresy may have been cast in the teeth of Bachiarius and his countrymen, we shall find it extremely difficult to make his words fit any country except Ireland. If we assume that he was an Irishman, accused of Pelagianism, quite a number of difficulties vanish as if by magic. The whole position becomes clear and natural. We know that Ireland was, in point of fact, accused of Pelagianism, thanks to St. Jerome's racy invectives against Pelagius, whom he described as 'a great corpulent dog from Albion, with Scottish ancestors in the vicinity of Britain.' These invectives were penned between 415 and 420. If Bachiarius were a Briton, a Gaul, or a Spaniard, he could not protest that his country was misjudged on account of one man. Pelagianism was rampant in Britain in 429, and again in 447. Semipelagianism was rife in Southern Gaul, among its adepts being Cassian and Gennadius. In any case, it could not be said that Spain or Gaul had become suspect through the fault of one man. The only country of which that assertion could justly be made was Ireland. Hence the *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, an admirable product of German Catholic scholarship, gives this cautious account of Bachiarius :—

Bachiarius (Bachines), an Irish (or Spanish ?) monk (afterwards bishop) of the fifth century ; suspected of Priscillianism, and denied admission to monasteries in Rome ; died, presumably as bishop, with a reputation for sanctity. Works : *Liber de fide*, in vindication of his orthodoxy ; *Liber de reparatione lapsi ad Januarium* (recommends the re-admission of one who had fallen). Schepss and others identify him with the holy Bishop Peregrinus, who revised the Priscillianist text of Holy Scripture, in a Catholic sense, for use in Spain.[1]

Bachiarius was clearly a foreigner : the possibility of his having been an Italian is out of the question. Muratori believed that the Confession of Faith was directed against the heresies of Helvidius and Jovinian, who were active in Rome between 380 and 390 ; but we have no record that any nation was notoriously suspect of having embraced their errors. Several modern scholars, with excellent reason,

[1] *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, Bd. I (1907), 448. I have omitted the references to authorities.

assume that the Bachiarius tract was a bye-product of the fight against Priscillianism, a heresy which won its greatest triumphs in Spain and Gaul after the execution of Priscillian by the usurper Maximus, at Trier, in 385. These scholars infer that Bachiarius was a Spaniard; but they quite fail to account for his impassioned appeal against the injustice of condemning his country for the sake of one man. We know that Priscillianism had a large following in Spain, and could reckon its adherents even among the Spanish episcopate. Priscillian himself became Bishop of Avila; two of his partisans, Instantius and Salvianus, were Spanish Bishops also; so were Symphosius and Dictinius, Bishops of Galicia in the north-west of Spain. It is not very likely that a Spaniard of that era could proclaim, with obvious honesty, that his country was being maligned on account of one man.

Besides, there is a curious and significant parallelism between the facts that we know of Bachiarius and the facts that we know of St. Mochta. Bachiarius is described as a monk. He is said to have become a bishop. He enjoyed a reputation for sanctity. His country was unjustly traduced for some unnamed heresy. He addressed a resounding protest to the Pope, coupled with a statement of the Catholic Faith, as held by himself and his countrymen. This statement shows him to have been an able man, remarkably familiar with Scripture, and very well versed in the theology of his time.

This description agrees almost exactly with what we know of St. Mochta. The Saint of Louth was a monk and abbot; he was also a bishop. His reputation for holiness is unquestionable. He certainly spent some time in Rome, where Irishmen were certainly under suspicion of Pelagianism. His Life tells us that an angel commanded him to study Scripture in Rome; and that, in the Eternal City, 'divinis incubuit studiis, Deo et hominibus gratiosus, fiebatque in dies se ipso sapientior et sanctior, vita et sermone alios ædificans, confluebantque ad ipsum discipuli.' [1] Thus,

[1] *Acta SS.*, Aug. iii. 743.

he must have spent some considerable time in the study of Scripture and Theology in Rome, where he eventually attracted the favourable notice of the Pope, by whom he was created bishop.

The similarity between the two sets of circumstances is rather striking. In each case we have a man who was a monk, a bishop, and a saint; in each case, his country is unjustly maligned for heresy, *because of one man*; in each case, the visitor is brought into relations in Rome with the reigning Pope. The circumstances are so similar as to suggest identity. The identification of Bachiarius with St. Mochta was first proclaimed in print by John Bale, on what manuscript authority we know not, in the mid-sixteenth century. On Bale's Catalogue of British Writers, the *Dictionary of National Biography* observes: 'Still its learning is considerable, and it deserves independent consideration, as it was founded on an examination of manuscripts in monastic libraries, many of which have since been lost.'[1]

Such, in outline, is the case for St. Mochta's authorship of the Faith of Bachiarius; it practically implies the identification of Bachiarius with Mochta. But there are insuperable difficulties in the way. For the sake of clearness, it will be better to mention only one or two difficulties at this stage.

In the first place, we know that St. Mochta was a Briton. How, then, could he speak of Ireland as his *Patria*, or his *Provincia* (Ireland was never a 'province' in the Roman sense), or *solum nostrum originale*? Of course, one might readily rejoin that, coming to Ireland in infancy, he regarded himself as an Irishman, and wrote as such; but this facile solution would not be altogether satisfactory.

Again, Pelagianism was the only heresy of which Irishmen were suspected; and Mochta, according to the theory, was supposed to be infected with the alleged national heresy. If such were the case, Pelagianism was the heresy which he would be most careful to combat in his Confession

[1] *D.N.B.*, iii. 42.

of Faith. The theory breaks down badly at this point; for the author of the Confession of Faith says not a word in regard to Pelagianism, though he vigorously opposes the errors of Novatian, Helvidius, Jovinian, and above all those of Priscillian. It seems incredible that St. Mochta could have been the writer; if he were, he would have given us a detailed refutation of Pelagianism, instead of combating heresies which no one had ever thought of imputing to the people of Ireland. The case becomes still more hopeless when we endeavour to reconcile the theory of St. Mochta's authorship with the manuscript tradition.

The early Irish authorities on St. Mochta make no mention whatever of his having written a Confession of Faith. Only three writings are credited to him in old Irish sources. These are :—

I. A Rule for his Monks. The Life tells us that, after founding his first monastery at Kilmore-Edan, in the woods of Omeath, Mochta was the ruler and the living rule of the community. The brethren read in his life, as in an open book, how they should rightly order their own lives. He surpassed them all in holiness and justice before God. Besides following the customary exercises of religious life, he engaged in many private devotions, in which he excelled everybody. None of the rest could emulate his arduous example. To preserve the devout practices of his community from oblivion or neglect; to transmit them fully and faithfully to the monks of his own day and to those of future ages, Mochta wrote a Rule for the guidance of his holy brotherhood: *Sanctæ institutionis regulam scripsit.*[1]

II. A Latin letter, beginning: 'Mauchteus peccator, prespiter, sancti Patricii discipulus, in Domino salutem,' is ascribed to St. Mochta by the *Annals of Ulster* (*s.a.* 534). The addressee's name is missing from the title; the letter

[1] *Acta SS.*, Aug. iii. 744. This seems to imply that Mochta wrote a Monastic Rule, in the proper sense of the term, as distinguished from certain other Rules, whereof Gougaud speaks (*Chrétientés Celtiques*, 85-88).

itself is lost. It is scarcely necessary to add that of Mochta's Rule for his monks no trace now remains.

Lanigan, Reeves, and O'Hanlon suspected that Mochta was not a bishop, since he merely styles himself a priest in the superscription of this letter. Without attempting to deal fully with the question here, I may say that the balance of evidence seems to lean decisively towards the other side, and that the passages in which Mochta's episcopal character is passed over in silence, can be easily explained. For instance, Œngus the Culdee and St. Cuimine of Connor had no earthly reason for mentioning the fact that Mochta was a bishop. They were writing poetry on the characteristics of Irish saints, not on their ecclesiastical dignities. In the present instance, St. Mochta may have written his Latin letter before he became an abbot or a bishop; or he may have called himself merely a priest, just as he called himself a sinner, out of humility.

III. From three entries in the *Annals of Ulster*, it would seem that St. Mochta also wrote a chronicle of some kind. These Annals inform us that 'the first prey was taken by the Saxons from Ireland' in 434—two years after St. Patrick's arrival. A notable tribute to the accuracy of the Annalists may be found in the fact, established by recent research, that the first Saxon invasions of Britain occurred in 428, and not in 449, as stated by Bede.[1] The Saxons evidently made a raid on some part of Ireland about six years after their descent on England.

Their second raid on Ireland took place in 471, and is attested by Mochta—apparently the Saint of Louth, who was alive at the time: 'The second prey of the Saxons from Ireland, as some say, was carried off in this year, as Maucteus (i.e., Mochtae) states. So I find in the Book of Cuana.'[2]

In 511 (512) we have a record of the death of a pagan King of Ireland. This was Lugaid, the conqueror of Ailill Molt, and son of the former monarch, Laegaire. Lanigan,

[1] Gougaud, *Chrétientés Celtiques*, xxv. 4.
[2] *Annals of Ulster*, *s.a.* 471.

with his usual asperity, describes Lugaid as 'at least as impious as his father'; and adds that he was killed by thunder, 'as a just judgment for his obstinacy in infidelity, and his opposition to the Christian religion.' [1] In any case, the record of King Lugaid's death may well have been borrowed from St. Mochta, who was his contemporary: 'A.D. 511 [512]. In this year, the death of Lugaid, son of Laegaire, according to the Book of the Monks.' [2]

Very different was the death of St. Brigid of Kildare, which is assigned to a rather late date, 527 (528), on the authority, apparently, of St. Mochta, who was still alive. At any rate, the record in the *Annals* runs thus: 'A.D. 527 [528]. In this year, the repose of Brigid, according to the Book of Mochod.' [3]

Now, it is worthy of note that so unsparing a critic as Dr. B. MacCarthy regards Mochta, the chronicler of the second Saxon raid, as identical with our St. Mochta,[4] and Mr. W. M. Hennessy suggests, very reasonably, that the Book of the Monks may be identical with the Book of Mochod. Looking at the three entries together, and remembering that St. Mochta was admittedly the author of one of them, and that he was a contemporary of the three events recorded, we cannot help suspecting that the three items were derived from a single source. That source was the Chronicle of St. Mochta, which is once cited under his own name, once as the Book of the Monks (of Louth), and once as the Book of Mochod. This latter term may be a variant or corruption of Mochta's name, and is found nowhere else. If this view is correct, it throws an interesting little sidelight on one of the sources from which our Irish Annals have been derived.

We may now take a step further. The record of the second Saxon raid was copied from St. Mochta by the chronicler, Cuanu, and re-copied from Cuanu into the *Annals of Ulster*. Who was this Cuanu? He was a personage to whom Prof. MacNeill attaches considerable

[1] *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*, i. 418.
[2] *Annals of Ulster, s.a.* 511.
[3] Ibid., *s.a.* 527.
[4] Ibid., iv. 273.

importance.[1] No fewer than eleven entries, ranging from from A.D. 467 to A.D. 628 (629), are expressly cited in the *Annals of Ulster* from the Chronicle of Cuanu, which was known as the *Liber Cuanach.*

Prof. Zimmer ingeniously tries to show that Cuanu the chronicler was none other than Cuana mac Ailcene, chief of Fermoy, whose death is noted by the Four Masters under A.D. 640 ; and Prof. Bury has subscribed to Zimmer's view.[2] But while we know that Cuana of Fermoy was famed for generosity and hospitality, there is no evidence that he indulged in literary pursuits. Indeed, the character of a chronicler is one that sits ill on the hearty, open-handed prince of Fermoy. Moreover, Prof. Bury is palpably mistaken in asserting that 'many of the entries in question relate to the affairs of South Ireland.' If a prince of Fermoy wrote a chronicle, we should expect a good many records of occurrences in the territory now known as Munster ; yet in the entries cited from the *Liber Cuanach* we find that such records are singularly few.

A brief analysis will make this clear. Cuanu records the deaths of six saints—Benignus of Armagh, Iserninus of Aghade in Carlow, Mac Caille of Offaly, Canice of Aghaboe, Comgall of Bangor, Colman Elo of Lynally in Offaly ; and to these he adds an obituary notice of Ailither, abbot of Clonmacnois. He relates four scenes in which Ailill Molt, King of Ireland, played a leading part. He tells of that monarch's death in battle, and of the assassination of two joint Kings of Ireland who came later. The kings of Ireland at that time had their royal residence at Tara. Cuanu also notices the death of one chief of Hy Many, the assassination of another, and the demise of a King of Connacht. He tells us of a Munster king who fell in battle at Kellistown, Co. Carlow, and is so little versed in Munster affairs that he mistakes the birth for the death of another King of Munster. He tells us of the death of a King of the Picts ; of an earthquake at Bairche, in the present Co. Down ; of the murder of a prince of Offaly, and the demise of a

[1] *Phases of Irish History*, 190, 193. [2] *Life of St. Patrick*, 281.

northern chieftain, whose father was sometime King of Ireland. The list is completed by a battle near Mullingar, another at a place called Cuil Coil, and a quotation from St. Mochta of Louth, in reference to the Saxon raid.

This is hardly the kind of chronicle that we should expect from the pen of a prince of Fermoy. Indeed, an Irish prince in the character of a scribe or sage was almost an unheard-of rarity. Cuanu's entries are such as we should expect from a monastic annalist residing in Louth or Meath. The ecclesiastical interest is prominent in these entries ; so is the All-Ireland interest ; and the writer displays a special familiarity with Midland events.

The case for Cuanu of Fermoy is not greatly improved by Mr. T. P. O'Nolan's comment :—

> It is remarkable that the last year for which AU. quotes the authority of ' The Book of Cuanu ' is the same year to which Tighernach assigns the death of our Cuanu's father. If our Cuanu was identical with the author of *Liber Cuanach*, he appears to have desisted from his scholarly work when he became king. Note also how the three poets praise Cuanu in the poem on his death, which shows that he had been a patron of literature.[1]

He was a patron of literature in the sense that he was liberal to the bards, as well as generous to the poor and hospitable to his friends. But the three poets say no word to suggest that Cuanu was himself an author. They could have praised him in exactly the same strains if he had been quite illiterate.

It is no wonder, therefore, that O'Curry and Prof. MacNeill were led to seek the chronicler's habitat in Meath, and to identify him with ' Cuanu nepos Bessain scriba Treoit '—Cuanu, grandson of Bessan, scribe of the abbey of Trevet, in the present barony of Skreen, Co. Meath—whose death is assigned by the Four Masters to 734 and by the *Annals of Ulster* to 738 (739). ' The death of a person named Cuana,' a scribe of Trevet, is recorded in the *Annals of Ulster* at the year 738, ' after which year no quotation from Cuana's Book occurs in these Annals ; whence it may be inferred that this Cuana was the compiler of the work

[1] R.I.A. *Proc.*, xxx. C. 1912, p. 276.

known as the Book of Cuana, or Cuanach.' [1] This was the slender ground of O'Curry's opinion.

Certainly this Cuana, dwelling in close proximity to Tara, was admirably placed for acquiring a knowledge of the events recorded in the *Liber Cuanach*. Louth, as the crow flies, would be some twenty miles further north, yet within easy reach of all the information transmitted to us in the *Liber Cuanach*. Unfortunately, nothing more is known of Cuana, the scribe of Trevet; and the theory of his having written the *Liber Cuanach* must remain an interesting and plausible piece of guesswork.

For my own part, I cannot help thinking that Colgan was right[2] in identifying Cuanu the chronicler with Cuanu, abbot of Louth, who 'went in exile to the land of Munster, with the shrine of St. Mochta' in A.D. 817 (818), and whom we again meet, a few years later, as 'Cuanu the sage, bishop of Louth,' who 'fell asleep in the Lord' in 824 (825).

To my mind, the history reconstructs itself in this wise. We know that St. Mochta had a flourishing monastic school at Louth. We know that his school was renowned for the vast number of priests and bishops who received their early formation under the personal guidance of the holy founder. We know that St. Mochta himself wrote a Monastic Rule, a Latin letter, and a chronicle, apparently, of contemporary events. We know that the tradition of literary activity was kept alive in the abbey of Louth for six hundred years —until the twelfth century or later. From the time of Cuidgile, abbot and scribe of Louth, who died in 742, we catch various glimpses of scribes and sages who flourished in that famous abbey, in spite of Norsemen's raids and other disasters, down to Marianus O'Gorman, who compiled the Martyrology which bears his name, and was abbot of Louth in 1172, at the time of the English Invasion.

Of all the abbots and learned men of Louth, from St. Mochta to Marianus O'Gorman, perhaps none was more

[1] O'Curry, *Manuscript Materials*, 19; cf. MacNeill, *Phases of Irish Hist.*, 193.

[2] *Acta SS. Hib.*, 736.

distinguished than Cuanu the Wise, who went into exile in the land of Munster, bearing with him the shrine of his sainted founder—perhaps for safety—and who died as Bishop of Louth in 824 (825). That he cherished the memory of St. Mochta with particular reverence seems tolerably clear. That St. Mochta's Chronicle was reverently preserved in the abbey of Louth, of which Cuanu was abbot, may be taken for granted. That the abbey of Louth, in the century following St. Mochta's death (535–629), was within easy reach of the information from Tara and other centres which was reproduced in the Book of Cuanu, may be regarded as certain. That Cuanu dealt with (the chronology at least of) the pre-Christian period, and that he quoted from St. Mochta for the Christian period, is also certain. The highly probably inference seems to be that Cuanu the chronicler, intent on recording events of the distant past, was none other than Cuanu the Wise, abbot and Bishop of Louth.

Thus we have three claimants, belonging to three distinct centuries, for the honour of having written the *Liber Cuanach*. These are Cuanu of Fermoy, A.D. 640; Cuanu of Trevet, A.D. 739; and Cuanu of Louth, A.D. 825. In my view, Cuanu of Louth would be the first of those philosophical annalists or synthetic historians of whom Prof. MacNeill has written so learnedly. And we must remember that the profession of a scribe in those days implied far more than it does in our time. The scribe, as Skene reminds us, was 'a learned man among the monks, who was selected for the purpose not only of transcribing and preserving the ancient records of the monastery, but likewise of exercising the functions of teacher and public lecturer. One of the earliest monuments of their industry is the MS. termed the Book of Armagh. It was compiled by Ferdomnach, "a sage and choice *Scribhnidh* of the church of Armagh," at the instance of Torbach, abbot of Armagh, who had himself been a scribe and lector of the church; and, as he was only one year in the abbacy, and died in the year 808, this fixes the date of the compilation

of the book at the year 807.' [1] It would seem, therefore, that the compilation of the famous Book of Armagh was soon followed by the appearance of Cuanu's chronicle, the *Liber Cuanach*, in Louth.

A fourth candidate for the authorship of the *Liber Cuanach* is proposed by Dr. Douglas Hyde : 'St. Cuanna, another member of Lismore [community], was probably the author of the Book of Cuanach, now lost, but often quoted in the *Annals of Ulster*. He died in 650, and the book is not quoted after the year 628, which makes it more than probable that he was the author.' [2] No doubt, the monk or bishop of Lismore was far more likely than the prince of Fermoy to have written a chronicle. The former must have been a man of education, while the latter need not necessarily have known how to write his name. Unfortunately for the claims of Cuana of Lismore, the incidents of his life are obscure and uncertain ; the original authorities do not affirm that he ever wrote anything ; he nowhere figures as a scribe or sage. Besides, the rarity of Munster episodes in the *Liber Cuanach* tells as strongly against Cuana of Lismore as against his namesake and contemporary of Fermoy. Sir James Ware, whose view of this matter has been sometimes misrepresented, conjectures that the *Liber Cuanach* was written either by the scribe of Trevet or by the Abbot-Bishop of Louth.[3] Perhaps Cuana of Louth was also the author of the Latin Life of St. Mochta.

Certain it is, in any case, that none of the old Irish authorities ascribes to St. Mochta the authorship of a Confession of Faith. The Confession which has been mistakenly credited to St. Mochta was first discussed about the year 480, by Gennadius of Marseilles, who attributes its authorship to a Christian philosopher named Bachiarius, as we shall see in a further article.

[1] Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, iii. 423.

[2] *Literary History of Ireland*, 211, 212.

[3] *De Scriptoribus Hiberniæ*, 1639, p. 19. Ware also had the rather wild idea that St. Kevin may have been the author.

III

ST. JEROME gave a memorable account of a hundred and thirty-five Christian writers in his *De Viris Illustribus*, written at Bethlehem in A.D. 392. Nearly a century later, Gennadius of Marseilles conceived the happy idea of supplementing St. Jerome's work, and extending the roll of honour to his own time. Less ample than that of Jerome, the *De Viris Illustribus* of Gennadius, otherwise known as his *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, deals with a hundred Christian authors in as many brief chapters or sections. The first ninety chapters, including that on Bachiarius, are believed to have been written about A.D. 480; the remaining ten chapters were added afterwards by Gennadius himself or by others. The chapter on Bachiarius (c. 24) occurs quite early in the work; and Gennadius is the earliest writer (in fact, the only early writer) by whom Bachiarius is named. Dr. Ernest Cushing Richardson, who has shown an infinite capacity for taking pains over the extant manuscripts of Jerome and Gennadius, thus writes of the latter and his work:—

The work of Gennadius was written about 480 according to some, or 492 to 495 according to others. Ebert, with the Benedictines and others before him, makes an almost conclusive argument in favour of the earlier date, on the ground that Gennadius speaks of Timotheus Aelurus, who died in 477, as still living. This compels the rejection of the paragraph on Gennadius himself as by a later hand, but this should probably be done at any rate, on other grounds. The MSS. suggest that Gennadius ended with John of Antioch, although an hypothesis of three editions before the year 500, of which perhaps two were by Gennadius, has grounds. The bulk of the work at least was composed about 480 (probably chapters 1–90), and the remainder added perhaps within a few years by Gennadius, or more probably by two other hands. Gennadius' style is as bare and more irregular than Jerome's, but he more frequently expresses a critical judgment, and gives more interesting glimpses of his own—the

semi-Pelagian—point of view. The work appears more original than Jerome's, and as a whole hardly less valuable, though the period he covers is so much shorter. . . .

The manuscripts of Jerome and Gennadius are numerous. The translator [Dr. Richardson] has seen 84 MSS. of Jerome and 57 of Gennadius, and has certain memoranda of at least 25 more, and hints of still another score. It is certainly within bounds to say that there are more than 150 MSS. of Jerome extant, and not less than 100 of Gennadius. The oldest of those examined (and all the oldest of which he could learn were seen) are at Rome, Verona, Vercelli, Montpellier, Paris, Munich, and Vienna.[1]

Let us now see what Gennadius knew, or fancied he knew, about Bachiarius. This is not quite as simple as it sounds, for the chapter on Bachiarius has suffered sorely at the hands of critics and scribes. Hardly a phrase, hardly a comma, has escaped their manipulation. Of the various texts of the Bachiarius passage that I happen to have seen, the one which Bernoulli published in 1895, from a defective Vercelli manuscript, is easily the worst.[2] A year later Dr. Richardson published an excellent critical text, with which we may well rest content, except as regards a small matter of punctuation :—

Bachiarius, vir christianae philosophiae nudus et expeditus, vacare Deo disponens, etiam peregrinationem pro conservanda propositi integritate elegit. Edidisse dicitur grata opuscula, sed ego ex illis unum tantum *De fide* librum legi, in quo satisfacit pontifici urbis adversum quaerulos et infamatores peregrinationis suae, et indicat se non timore hominum sed Dei causa peregrinationem suscepisse, ut exiens de terra et cognatione sua co-heres fieret Abrahae patriarchae.[3]

A few variants must be noticed here. At least one manuscript reads *Bachiarius episcopus*, thus making Bachiarius a bishop. Another reads *vir philosophiae nudus et*

[1] *Theodoret, Jerome, Gennadius and Rufinus*, by Ernest Cushing Richardson, Ph.D., Librarian of Princeton College, pp. 353, 354. Prof. Diekamp, of Münster University, in the *Römische Quartalschrift*, 12 [1898], pp. 411 ff., also holds that the work of Gennadius has been retouched more than once. Diekamp's article, which I have been unable to see, is mentioned in the *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, I. 1638.

[2] *Hieronymus und Gennadius De Viris Inlustribus*, herausgegeben von Lic. Carl Albrecht Bernoulli (Freiburg im Breisgau,1895), p. 71. Bernoulli's edition of Gennadius was based on Cod. Vercell. 183 ; it is to be found in Krüger's *Sammlung ausgewälter Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften*, Heft XI.

[3] In Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 14 [1896], p. 71.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

expeditus, omitting *Christianae*. The Codex Corbeiensis, an ancient and valuable manuscript, has *vir Christianae disciplinae expeditus*. Great diversity exists in regard to the phrase *pro conservanda propositi integritate*. Some MSS. read simply *pro conservanda integritate*, while others have *pro conservanda vitae integritate*, and still others read *ad conservandam vitae* [al. *propositi*] *integritatem*, or simply *ad conservandam integritatem*. Bernoulli has *tetegit* for *elegit*—a sad blunder. The ordinary punctuation is changed by Oudin, Fabricius, Fritzsche, and Künstle, who prefer to read : *Bachiarius, vir Christianae philosophiae, nudus et expeditus vacare Deo disponens*. In Fritzsche's posthumous article *cavare* is substituted for *vacare*, doubtless by a misprint. Bernoulli, in like manner, has a punctuation and arrangement of his own : *indicans se non timore hominum sed dei, causam peregrinationis suscepisse*.

Muratori adopts the ordinary reading and punctuation of the first clauses—*Bachiarius, vir Christianae philosophiae nudus et expeditus, vacare Deo disponens*—and observes, very naturally, that the word *nudus* seems to be wrong. Its obvious meaning is that Bachiarius was ignorant of Christian philosophy, whereas his Confession of Faith proves that he was very well informed on the subject—in a sense which we shall presently consider. Besides, that enigmatic personage, Honorius of Autun,[1] about the year 1150, found *nitidus et expeditus* in his copy of Gennadius. Muratori, therefore, proposes to read *nitidus* instead of *nudus*, more especially as Gennadius himself (c. 90) speaks of Gennadius, Patriarch of Constantinople, as *vir lingua nitidus et ingenio acer* : 'a man brilliant in speech and of strong genius,' as Richardson translates it. Unfortunately, in this last instance, the word *nitidus* is used with the ablative construction ; it could scarcely be used with the genitive or dative,

[1] Honorius has been claimed alternately by France and Germany, but he seems to have been originally a monk of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, whence he was surnamed *Augustinensis*, corrupted afterwards into *Augustodunensis*. He was an indefatigable writer ; seems to have lived as an *inclusus* in one of the Irish monasteries in Germany, where he revived some of the doctrines of Scotus Eriugena (*Kirchliches Handlexikon*, I., 2016.) His career and writings deserve to be studied by some Irish scholar.

as Muratori proposes. J. A. Fabricius notes Muratori's preference for *nitidus*, but holds that *nudus* is correct; that *nudus* and *expeditus* have here the same meaning,—they add force to the suggestion that Bachiarius abandoned home and friends, in order to devote himself freely to the service of God. Perhaps the best plan would be to adopt the punctuation which is favoured by Oudin, Fabricius, Fritzsche, and Künstle, and to read: *Bachiarius, vir Christianae philosophiae, nudus et expeditus vacare Deo disponens.* In any case, the Latin construction is rather peculiar.[1]

The manuscripts of Gennadius, as a rule, seem to reproduce the name of Bachiarius with only trifling variants. Suffridus Petri reads *Bacciarius*; the Codex Martiniensis and the Codex Corbeiensis—two very important manuscripts—have *Bacharius*. On the whole, there seems to be surprisingly little difference among the manuscripts on this point. If Bachiarius were merely a scribe's misreading of one of the numerous Latin forms of St. Mochta's name, this practical unanimity would be nearly impossible.

Apart from minor matters of detail, the salient ideas of Gennadius in regard to Bachiarius are clear enough, though most of them are wrong. Gennadius represents Bachiarius as a Christian philosopher, who has devoted himself to the service of God. This philosopher undertakes a pilgrimage for the preservation of something—it may be his life, his virtue, or his resolution to serve God. He is said to have written some pleasing little works, of which Gennadius has read only one. This was a treatise *On Faith*, in which the author vindicates himself to the Roman Pontiff against the assailants of his pilgrimage. He shows that his pilgrimage was undertaken, not through fear of men, but for God's sake; so that, leaving his fatherland and kindred, he might inherit the promises made to Abraham.

As a literary curiosity, I may subjoin Dr. Richardson's rendering of the passage:—

> Bachiarius, a Christian philosopher, prompt and ready and minded to devote his time to God, chose travel as a means of preserving the

[1] Fabricius' edition of Gennadius is in Migne, *P.L.*, 58, 1059-1119.

integrity of his purpose. He is said to have published acceptable small works, but I have only read one of them, a work *On Faith*, in which he justified himself to the chief priest of the city, defending himself against those who complained and misrepresented his travel, and asserting that he undertook his travel, not through fear of men but for the sake of God, that going forth from his land and kindred he might become a co-heir with Abraham the partiarch.[1]

It is amusing to note the devices by which some recent critics seek to eliminate the Pope and the pilgrimage from this passage of Gennadius. Dr. Richardson, as his version shows, is one of these. The general body of scholars, however, seem to find no difficulty in understanding Gennadius to mean that Bachiarius submitted his Confession of Faith to the Pope, and that he set out on his travels with a religious end in view ; in other words, that he undertook a pilgrimage. In classical Latin, no doubt, *peregrinari* meant to travel abroad, or to dwell as a stranger in a foreign land ; but the religious connotation of *peregrinatio*, in this instance, sufficiently shows that Gennadius meant something like a pilgrimage, in our sense of the word. Between Bachiarius and our own St. Columba lies a span of a century and a half ; but they are united by a common Faith, and a common desire, *peregrinari pro Christo*.

Fritzsche admits, quite frankly, that Gennadius meant the Bishop of Rome, as the person to whom Bachiarius addressed his Confession of Faith ; but he adds, without a semblance of proof, that Gennadius was mistaken on this point, and that ' the addressee is to be sought in a monastery.' [2] Dr. Burn's view is probably not very different from that of Dr. Fritzsche :—

A further suggestion may be made, that in this rule of faith [the Athanasian Creed] special care was taken to guard against the heresy of Priscillianism. Priscillianism was a sort of hazy Adoptionism, with a mixture of Manichean elements, and a tendency to an Apollinarian denial of the Lord's human soul. From Spain it had spread widely, especially in the garb of monasticism ; and at the beginning of the fifth century all monks who came from Spain were closely examined in their faith. *The Faith of Bachiarius*, found in the Milan MS. (O. 212 *sup.*) with an

[1] Richardson's *Theodoret, Jerome*, etc., p. 390.
[2] *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 17 (1897), p. 213 n.

early text of the Quicunque, was the defence of such a monk to the Bishops of Gaul, on the doctrines of the Trinity, the humanity of Christ, the resurrection, etc.[1]

So far as Bachiarius is concerned, this theory of Dr. Burn's seems unsatisfactory on several grounds. In the first place, it contradicts the formal testimony of Gennadius, who says that Bachiarius *satisfacit Pontifici Urbis*, not that he justified himself to the Bishops of Gaul. Indeed, if Bachiarius were a Spanish monk, he would most likely be questioned in the first instance by the Bishops of Southern Gaul; and Gennadius, writing in Marseilles some four-score years later, would be very likely to have heard something of the incident, more especially as Bachiarius was no common or garden monk, but a distinguished 'philosopher' and author, whom Gennadius deemed worthy of inclusion in his list of Illustrious Men.

Secondly, is there decisive evidence to show that Bachiarius was a monk? We know that there is manuscript evidence, of a sort, for regarding him as a bishop. Muratori asserts that the Ambrosian MS. of Bachiarius, *De Reparatione Lapsi*, is entitled *Incipit liber Sancti Bachiarii Monachi ad Januarium de reparatione lapsi.*[2] This seems to be disproved by Gallandi, who has corrected sundry small mistakes in Muratori's edition of Bachiarius, and who prints this treatise, from an accurate copy of the Ambrosian MS., with the simple superscription: *Bachiarii ad Januarium liber de reparatione lapsi.*[3] The Ambrosian MS. of the *Fides Bachiarii* is the only one known to be extant, but several MSS. of his *De Reparatione Lapsi* ought to exist somewhere. These deserve to be studied for an answer to the question: Was Bachiarius a monk, or was he a bishop?

Fritzsche is wrong in saying that Gennadius makes Bachiarius a monk, as if 'monk' were equivalent to *vir Christianae philosophiae*; and adds that Bachiarius was a

[1] Burn, *The Athanasian Creed*, 1896, p. lxxv.; based on Neander, *Ch. Hist.* (trans.), iv. p. 507.

[2] *Anecdota Ambr.*, ii. 7, 8.

[3] Migne, *P.L.*, 20, 1037, 1038. Strangely enough, the two tracts are printed in Migne, under the general heading 'Bachiarius Monachus.'

very zealous monk. After this fanciful piece of criticism, Fritzsche goes on to say :—

Bachiarius, according to tradition, was a Briton. Muratori doubted this, without definitely stating whence he came. The unnamed author of 'Bachiarius Illustratus' [1] rightly recognized that the home of Bachiarius was to be sought in the Spanish province of Galicia. There, in ancient times, was a respectable city with an episcopal see, known as Britona, Britonia, or Britania, two miles from Mondonedo. This degenerated afterwards into the miserable village of Bretagna. Hence the statement that Bachiarius was a Briton.

Fritzsche is on safer ground when he argues that Bachiarius must have written his Confession of Faith in the first or second decade of the fifth century—that is, between 400 and 420—and that he must have been an older contemporary of Orosius, the protégé of St. Augustine, as Gallandi had suggested long before. 'For the rest, Priscillianism had made such strides in Galicia at that time that the very name of Galician was enough to render a person suspect.' [3] That is quite true, but it undermines Fritzsche's contention that Bachiarius was a Galician. For if Bachiarius had come from Galicia, which was a hotbed of Priscillianism, how could he protest vehemently, as we know that he did, against the injustice of condemning or suspecting his *provincia* on account of one man ?

Dr. Burn suggested that the Athanasian Creed was written to counteract the influence of Priscillianism :

The suggestion [he adds] was warmly taken up by Dr. Künstle, Professor of Theology in the University of Freiburg-i-B., who in his book *Antipriscilliana* went a great deal further, and found traces of the controversy in a great many other formularies of the period, which he, without hesitation, assigns in a lump to Spain, the *Quicumque* included. It is impossible now to discuss each formulary on its merits, but it is obvious that such a sweeping conclusion is, to say the least, rash.[4]

[1] *De Priscilliani haeresi dissertatio, in Raccolta d'Opuscoli scientifici e filogici*, t. xxvii. (Venezia, 1742 , 8, pp. 74-76. I have been unable to discover a copy of this dissertation.

[2] *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, ut supra, p. 213. Britonia does not appear to have become an episcopal see until long after the time of Bachiarius. The earliest Bishop of Britonia mentioned by Gams is Mailoc, who flourished in 572. After 675, the place disappears from the list of Spanish sees.—Gams, *Series Episc.*, 50, 51.

[3] Fritzsche in *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* ut supra, p. 213.

[4] Burn, *The Athanasian Creed*, 2nd edit., 1918, p. 17.

I venture to think that Dr. Künstle's conclusion, in regard to Bachiarius, is equally rash. He styles Bachiarius a Spanish monk, and declares that there is general accord among scholars in regarding him as a Galician, who was suspected of Priscillianism, and whose *Liber de fide* was written to prove his orthodoxy.[1] If such accord exists, it would seem to be ill founded. Prof. Künstle himself has depicted Galicia as the very focus of the Priscillianist contagion in Spain.[2] How, then, could Bachiarius, if he were a Galician, have written so passionate and sincere a protest against the injustice of suspecting the orthodoxy of his countrymen, because of the misbelief of one man?

That scholars are by no means unanimous in regarding Bachiarius as a Galician monk is shown by the fascinating theory of Schepss and Berger, who would fain identify Bachiarius with the mysterious and holy Bishop Peregrinus, who corrected the 'canons' of Priscillian in a Catholic sense, and whose name appears (seemingly as editor) twice or thrice in ancient Spanish Bibles, as well as in the Irish Gospel of St. John in the Stowe Collection.[3] I shall be rather surprised if this theory, in an altered form, does not gain prominence in the near future. Set aside the improbable Galician story; discard the Gennadian fancies regarding the 'pilgrimage'; picture Bachiarius as a bishop in the south of Spain—perhaps not far from Seville—where Priscillianism was relatively unknown; suppose that he visits Rome at the time of the Priscillianist controversy; note his extraordinary familiarity with Scripture, and his antagonism to the Priscillianist heresy,—and you can elaborate a most interesting theory as to the identity of Bachiarius with Peregrinus.

In its present form, the theory has been rejected by Fritzsche, who remarks drily that 'it would be very pretty if it were only true.' He is led to dismiss it by reason of its dependence on the Gennadian fictions in regard to the 'pilgrimage.' Bishop Wordsworth and Dr. White also reject

[1] Künstle, *Antipriscilliana*, 163, 164.
[2] Ibid. 138.
[3] Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, 1893, p. 28.

the theory, partly because Bachiarius is said by various writers to have been a monk, not a bishop, and partly because certain expressions in his Confession of Faith (which expressions, I respectfully submit, are misunderstood by these eminent scholars) are deemed to be scarcely proper for a bishop. At the same time, Drs. Wordsworth and White find no difficulty in admitting what Drs. Richardson, Fritzsche, and Burn have denied, namely, that Bachiarius addressed his Confession of Faith to the Roman Pontiff [1]; just as Dr. Samuel Berger readily admits that, according to Gennadius, Bachiarius was 'a pilgrim, a traveller, and an exile.' It is truly exhilarating to witness the promptitude and skill with which one critic bowls out another.

We must now face, frankly and squarely, the question: What is the real value of the passage in Gennadius concerning Bachiarius? That passage is of more value for its position than for what it contains. Gennadius arranged his notices of Illustrious Men in a rough sort of chronological order; and it is plain from the place which he assigns to Bachiarius that he regarded him as having flourished about A.D. 400. To illustrate this, I subjoin the seven names which immediately precede that of Bachiarius, and the seven others which immediately follow, with their respective dates, as given by Dr. Richardson:—

Rufinus, born 345; at Jerusalem, *circa* 390; died 410.
Tichonius, 399.
Sulpicius Severus, born after 353, died about 410.
Antiochus, Bishop of Ptolemais, about 400, died about 408.
Severianus of Emesa, Bishop 400-403, died after 408.
Nicetas, Bishop before 392, died after 414.
Olimpius, Bishop of Barcelona, about 316.
BACHIARIUS, about 400.
St. Servais, Bishop of Tongres, 338; died Maestricht, 384.
Isaac, converted Jew, flourished about 385.
Ursinus, monk, flourished before 440.
Macarius, monk, fifth century.
Heliodorus of Antioch, flourished about 440.
St. John Chrysostom, born about 347, died 407.
John, Bishop of Jerusalem, 386-417.

[1] Wordsworth and White, *Novum Testamentum Latine*, 1898, I. 708.

Thirteen names intervene between Bachiarius and St. Augustine, who died in 430; and we find no fewer than twenty-nine names between Bachiarius and Pope St. Celestine, who died in 432. The inference presumably is that Bachiarius was a contemporary of these two Saints, but considerably older than either. We can safely say that he flourished about 400; and there is strong evidence to show that his Confession of Faith was written at some time between 400 and 412.

The Confession of Faith was certainly read by Gennadius; but he read it carelessly, or his remembrance of it became blurred and distorted by time. This was noticed by several of the older and more careful scholars, and it has been too commonly overlooked by modern critics. Muratori, who discovered and published the Confession of Faith in 1698, remarks in his very first note, that it is difficult to make out, from the works of Bachiarius himself, that he undertook any pilgrimage at all.[1] Gallandi observes that Bachiarius wrote his treatise in answer to those who accused him of the national heresy, and that Gennadius was quite wrong in regarding it as written against the assailants of the 'pilgrimage.'[2]

Gallandi adds that Gennadius had read the Confession of Faith in a very careless fashion (*nimis profecto incuriose*); that he had led many scholars, including Tillemont, astray, and that Florio was the first to discover, and reject, the errors of Gennadius on this head.[3] Alone among modern critics, so far as I am aware, Fritzsche has perceived that the whole story of the pilgrimage and its motives, as told by Gennadius, is groundless.[4]

Gennadius knew that Bachiarius had flourished about eighty years before his own time of writing. But he clearly

[1] 'Quamquam fateor difficile hinc posse cognosci peregrinationem ullam a Bachiario susceptam fuisse.'—In Migne, *P.L.*, 20, 1019.

[2] 'Bachiarius vero . . . de *fide libellum* scribit *adversus querulos et infamatores* non quidem *peregrinationis suae*, ut arbitrabatur Gennadius, sed potius adversus eos qui eum *de patrio errore* incusabant.'—Ibid. 1016.

[3] Ibid. 1017, 1018. I have searched in vain for a copy of Florio's dissertation, which is highly praised by Gallandi.

[4] *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* 17 (1897), p. 213.

knew nothing else about the man, save what he had gleaned from a former perusal of his Confession of Faith, and his recollections of that treatise were very erroneous. He rightly depicted Bachiarius as a Christian philosopher, though the term is misleading to modern ears. A philosopher in either the classical or the modern sense of the word, Bachiarius was not; but he was one in the original and broad meaning of the term, for he was a genuine lover of wisdom. Curiously enough, Irish scholars at the court of Charlemagne, four centuries later, were still styled 'philosophers' in the same sense; for the wide domain of philosophy was supposed to include the whole circle of the sciences, whether sacred or profane, positive or speculative.[1] Bachiarius had acquired a truly astonishing familiarity with the words and thoughts of Holy Writ. As his writings show, his mind was fairly saturated with Scripture, and he possessed a very accurate knowledge of the orthodox Christian thought of his time. That he was devoted to the service of God is clear from his own writings. But in what capacity he served God—whether as bishop, priest, or monk —we cannot as yet determine for certain.

Anything that Gennadius tells us of Bachiarius, and that happens to be true, we could have learned for ourselves from his two extant treatises. Most of what he tells us happens to be false, and it has misled scholars from the fifth century to the twentieth. That it should have deceived scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is not surprising, for the text of the *Fides Bachiarii* was unknown until Muratori gave it to the world in 1698. But it is rather unfortunate that so many scholars of the nineteenth century should have been content to accept the statements of Gennadius at their face value, in spite of the reservations and warnings of Muratori, Florio, and Gallandi.

Gennadius had read the Confession of Faith, but he failed to remember its most vital and salient features—its long-drawn, passionate protest against the injustice of imputing heresy to Bachiarius and his countrymen on account

[1] Gougaud, *Les Chrétientés Celtiques*, 278.

of one man, and its serried array of Catholic doctrines, stoutly held by the author and his compatriots, in opposition to Priscillianism and other heresies. Gennadius misunderstood and misrepresented the general drift of the Confession of Faith. It was merely fantastic to say that Bachiarius had undertaken a pilgrimage for the preservation of his integrity in some way or other; that his pilgrimage was assailed by murmurers and defamers; and that Bachiarius showed that his pilgrimage was undertaken, not through fear of men, but by zeal for God. The simple and obvious truth was that the orthodoxy of Bachiarius and his countrymen—not his pilgrimage or its motives—was assailed and called in question. It is true that he says, in effect, that since his conversion and baptism, he knows no fatherland save the Church of God; that he is a pilgrim upon this earth, and that he desires to become a co-heir of the promises made to Abraham. But this is language which most of us, in certain moods, might use; and, while using this language, Bachiarius is very careful to defend both himself and the people of his unnamed fatherland against the charge or suspicion of heresy. The fact that he speaks for his countrymen, no less than for himself, in almost every sentence of his Confession of Faith, seems to have escaped the notice of many modern critics.

If we would arrive at the truth concerning Bachiarius, we must discard Gennadius altogether. Indirectly, Gennadius enables us to infer that Bachiarius lived about the year 400; that is his sole contribution to our stock of knowledge in this department. The writings of Bachiarius form the only substantial and reliable scource of information concerning their author. These writings, as we have repeatedly noted, are two in number: first, the *Fides*, which is a document of many-sided importance; and secondly, the *De Reparatione Lapsi*, which is a characteristic production of the same pen. The most hopeful lines of investigation seem to be these:—

I. The MSS. of the *De Reparatione Lapsi*, to see if they throw any light on the ecclesiastical status of Bachiarius.

At the same time, we must remember that the headings of MSS. afford a favourite nesting-place for scribal and editorial errors.

II. The internal evidence deducible from his two treatises, when studied in the light of contemporary Christian literature.

The first of these inquiries is beyond my power to pursue. As regards the second, I can offer only a few rough notes, borrowed from such masters as Muratori and Gallandi. These notes must be reserved for a final article.

Meanwhile, we may claim that our inquiry, so far, has yielded two main results, which, though negative, are by no means negligible. In the first place, we have seen that many eminent writers were mistaken in ascribing the Confession of Faith to St. Mochta. That memorable document cannot rightly be described as a monument of the Faith of the Early Irish Church. It belongs to the period before an organized Christian Church existed in Ireland; and the theory of its Irish origin is neither proven nor probable. It seems to have been written, principally against Priscillianism, between the years 400 and 412, perhaps before Mochta was born, and certainly long before he became a disciple of St. Patrick in Ireland.

Secondly, we have seen that the statements of Gennadius are misleading and valueless, so far as Bachiarius, the real author of the Confession of Faith, is concerned. This point is scarcely less important than the former; for, down to the present day, scholars no sooner mention Bachiarius than they almost invariably cite the words of Gennadius concerning him. For nearly fifteen centuries Gennadius has proved a very delusive guide in matters relating to Bachiarius; he has led a long line of famous scholars astray; and it is high time that his assertions on this topic should be received with due caution.

IV

WHEN did Bachiarius write his famous Confession of Faith? To this question, I think, we can give a pretty definite answer. We can affirm, without much hesitation, that the Confession was composed in the first twelve or fifteen years of the fifth century, that is, between 400 and 412 or 415. The reasons for this view seem fairly decisive.

In the first place, as Gallandi long ago observed, Bachiarius repeatedly copies or imitates the *Apology* which Rufinus addressed to Pope Anastasius in the year 400. Rufinus had created no small stir—indeed, he had unchained a veritable storm—by his translations from Origen, as well as by his version of the first book of an Apology for Origen, written by the martyr, St. Pamphilus of Cæsarea. Mainly as a result of these translations, Rufinus was now at open war with St. Jerome; the former friends reviled each other in books and pamphlets, to the grief and dismay of St. Augustine, St. Chromatius of Aquileia, and other illustrious men, who sincerely esteemed both Rufinus and Jerome.

There is no doubt that the heterodox teaching of Origen, now made known to Latin Christendom through the translations of Rufinus, gave deep offence and caused much scandal. Pope Anastasius, whose brief reign lasted only from 399 to the close of 401, took a very serious view of the situation. He condemned the false doctrines of Origen, and was gravely displeased with Rufinus for introducing them to the western world. Meanwhile, Rufinus, who was then serving as a priest under St. Chromatius of Aquileia —it was in the terrible days of Alaric's invasion of northern Italy—addressed a letter in his own defence to the Roman

Pontiff. This Apology, as it is called, is a brief, frank, and manly document. Rufinus states that he acted merely as a translator; that, as he deserved no praise for the true and beautiful ideas that are found in Origen's works, so he deserved no blame for the heterodox views of that great writer.

The Apology of Rufinus, for all its brevity, is obviously original and spontaneous; it is a genuine human document. By comparison, the Confession of Bachiarius is lengthy and laboured. The Apology served, in some respects, as a model for the Confession. The resemblances between them are too remarkable to be accidental. If we consider, for instance, the passage on the Trinity and the Incarnation, it will be seen that Bachiarius has copied extensively from Rufinus—for assuredly Rufinus did not copy from Bachiarius:—

Rufinus.—Sciat quod de Trinitate ita credimus, quod unius naturæ sit, unius Deitatis, unius ejusdemque virtutis atque substantiæ; nec inter Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum sit prorsus ulla diversitas, nisi quod ille Pater est et hic Filius, et ille Spiritus Sanctus. Filium quoque Dei in novissimis diebus natum esse confitemur ex Virgine et Spiritu Sancto: carnem naturæ humanæ atque animam suscepisse, in qua passus est, et sepultus, et resurrexit a mortuis: in eadem ipsa carn resurgens quæ deposita fuerat in sepulcro: cum qua carne simul atque anima post resurrectionem ascendit in cælos: unde et venturus exspectatur ad judicium vivorum ac mortuorum.[1]

Bachiarius.—Sicque credimus beatissimam Trinitatem; quod unius naturae est, unius Deitatis, unius ejusdemque virtutis atque substantiae; nec inter Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum sit ulla diversitas, nisi quod ille Pater sit, et hic Filius, et ille Spiritus Sanctus; Trinitas in subsistentibus personis, Unitas in natura atque substantia. Filium quoque credimus in novissimis diebus natum esse de Virgine et Spiritu Sancto, carnem naturæ humanæ et animam suscepisse. In qua carne et passum et sepultum, resurrexisse a mortuis credimus et fatemur; et in eadem ipsa carne in qua jacuit in sepulcro, post resurrectionem ascendisse in cælum, unde venturum exspectamus ad judicium vivorum et mortuorum.[2]

The resemblance between these passages could not be accidental. Gallandi has no hesitation, and we need have none, in saying that Bachiarius copied from Rufinus: 'Haec

[1] Migne, *P.L.*, xxi. 625. [2] Ibid., xxi. 1023.

et plura deinceps totidem fere verbis sumpta sunt ex Apologia Rufini ad Anastasium.'

Again, Rufinus offers his Apology to Pope Anastasius as a stick to beat off the enemies who are barking at him : 'Ut æmulis, adversum me forte oblatrantibus, baculum quemdam tibi confessionis meæ, quo abigerentur, offerrem.'[1]

Bachiarius uses the same figure : 'Hic est baculus defensionis nostræ, quo murmurantium adversus nos ora feriamus, qui nos per viam hujus sæculi transeuntes . . . oblatrant.'[2]

Other resemblances are duly noted by Gallandi, but those just indicated will suffice for our purpose. We may regard it, therefore, as certain that Bachiarius imitated, or copied from, the Apology of Rufinus, which was written in 400. Hence the Confession of Bachiarius must have been written after the year 400.

On the other hand, since Bachiarius says not a solitary word in reprobation of Pelagian error, we may safely infer that he wrote before the Pelagian controversy had become acute, that is, before 413 or 415 at the latest.

Pelagius had been in Rome since the year 400, if not earlier. St. Augustine testifies that he had lived in Rome 'for a very long time' before setting out for Sicily and Africa in 409 or 411. During his long stay in the Eternal City, that able and accomplished heresiarch had certainly not been idle. He had perverted the nimble-witted Cælestius, a lawyer, whom many writers have regarded as an Irishman, but who is generally described by modern scholars as an Italian. Pelagius was violently indignant on hearing a bishop quote with approval the famous passage in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine (written in 400 or slightly earlier), where the great convert prayed to God, 'Give what Thou dost command, and command what Thou wilt' (*Da quod jubes et jube quod vis*). This incident, which we learn from St. Augustine himself,[3] occurred in Rome about the year 405.

[1] Migne, *P.L.*, xxi. 624. [2] Ibid. xx. 1029. [3] *De Bono Persev.*, c. 53.

Pelagius and his lieutenant do not seem to have been molested by the authorities in Rome. But their ideas were undoubtedly becoming known. They were known at Milan in or before the year that witnessed the departure of the two arch-heretics from Rome. In 411, six theses of Cælestius, which contained the quintessence of the Pelagian doctrine, were condemned by the Synod of Carthage, at the instance of the deacon, Paulinus of Milan. In Africa, the Pelagian ideas soon infected a wide area, especially around Carthage. St. Augustine and other bishops were compelled to take a resolute stand against the new errors, in sermons and in private conversations. Urged by his friend Marcellinus, 'who daily endured the most annoying debates with the erring brethren,' St. Augustine wrote two famous works against Pelagianism in 412. These were *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, and *De spiritu et littera*. After this, the controversy waxed fast and furious. In 414, disquieting rumours came from Sicily, and the so-called 'Definitiones Cælestii' were sent to St. Augustine, who published his *De perfectione justitiæ hominis* as a rejoinder in 414 or 415.

Meanwhile, Pelagius, who had gone to Palestine, was eagerly propagating his errors. His Letter to Demetrias, a noble Roman lady then resident at Carthage, and his *De Natura*, published in 415, are evidences of his activity. The latter treatise was promptly refuted by St. Augustine in his *De Natura et Gratia*, written in 415. St. Jerome now entered the lists with his Letter to Ctesiphon and his *Dialogus contra Pelagianos*. Pelagius was summoned before a diocesan synod at Jerusalem in 415; but the trial proved abortive, owing to his accuser's ignorance of Greek, a language of which Pelagius was a fluent and dexterous speaker.

Not the faintest hint of all this controversy appears in the pages of Bachiarius. Hence we can only infer that the controversy had not arisen, or had not become acute, when he wrote his Confession. We may regard it as having become acute after the condemnation of Cælestius at

Carthage in 411, and especially after the publication of St. Augustine's two anti-Pelagian works in 412. By the year 415, Pelagianism had become notorious in Sicily, Africa, and Palestine; and we have seen that its main tenets were well known to Paulinus, the deacon of Milan, as early as 411. It seems incredible that Bachiarius could have written his Confession, without making the least allusion to Pelagianism, after 412 or 415.

The majority of scholars, ancient and modern, have believed with Gennadius that Bachiarius wrote his Confession in Rome and addressed it to the reigning Pontiff. Indeed, certain expressions that he uses—notably, 'non moremur fidei nostrae regulam Beatitudini Tuæ, qui artifex es ipsius ædificii, demonstrare' [1]—seem to render any other conclusion arbitrary and improbable. Now, it seems incredible that Bachiarius, who was so well informed on the theological thought of his time, could have written his Confession after 412 or 415, in serene and blissful ignorance of the Pelagian errors, which had first been disseminated (secretly, no doubt) in Rome, and which had already set Sicily, Africa, and Palestine in a blaze.

This reasoning is confirmed by the cavalier fashion in which Bachiarius dismisses the Traducianist or Generationist theory in regard to the human soul: 'Sed nec illi assertioni tradimus manus, qua quidam superfluo delectantur, ut credant animas ex transfusione generari; quia contradicit huic suspicioni beatus David, dicendo, etc.' [2] It is pretty certain that Bachiarius would not have ventured to write in this strain after the publication of St. Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram.* That work was begun in 401 and finished in 415. It consists of twelve books, of which the seventh and tenth are entirely devoted to a discussion on the human soul. In the tenth book especially, the holy Doctor, under stress of Pelagian polemics, shows a marked inclination, tempered by many misgivings, to

[1] Muratori rightly lays stress on 'illustre hoc Bachiarii testimonium [circa] Romani Pontificis in rebus Fidei statuendis auctoritatem' (Migne, *P.L.*, xx. 1025).

[2] Migne, *P.L.*, xx. 1031.

embrace the Traducianist hypothesis. Tentative as were the views of St. Augustine on this head, they exercised an immense influence on the minds of Christian thinkers down to the golden age of Scholasticism, and even later. Bachiarius, assuredly, would not have ventured to contradict the great African Doctor in so offhand a fashion, had he written after 415, when St. Augustine's work became known.

The whole outlook of Bachiarius, his entire mentality, is that of a man who wrote before Pelagianism had arisen above the horizon. His main interest is centred in the fight against the older heresy of Priscillian, though he incidentally refutes the errors of Helvidius and Jovinian, who flourished about 380 or 390. Priscillian and his companions had been put to death in 385. Priscillianism was the heresy of which Bachiarius was held suspect; and modern scholars are agreed in regarding his Confession as, in the main, a skilful and detailed refutation of Priscillianism. He never mentions Priscillian by name; presumably, as Prof. Künstle believes, because that heretic had invented nothing new. Priscillianism was merely a conglomerate of old Eastern heresies; its materials were borrowed from Sabellianism, Manicheism, and Gnosticism.[1]

Prof. Künstle goes so far as to hold that Pelagius copied from Bachiarius. But the principal passage on which Dr. Künstle bases this view is precisely the passage on the Incarnation, which has been already cited in this article, and which, as we have seen, Bachiarius copied from Rufinus. That Pelagius copied from somebody is tolerably certain; but he is much more likely to have copied from Rufinus than from Bachiarius.[2] The reference to 'grades in the Trinity,' which occurs more or less clearly in Bachiarius and Pelagius, seems to have been a commonplace of orthodox controversy against Arianism.

Thus far we have seen that the Confession of Bachiarius was written after 400—since it depends on the Apologia of Rufinus—and not later than 412 or 415, since it is silent

[1] *Antipriscilliana*, 167. [2] Ibid. 84-86.

to the point of dumbness in regard to the Pelagian controversy, and since it brusquely rejects Traducianism, which was favoured by St. Augustine and many other orthodox thinkers after 415.

Archdeacon Venables, writing in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* over fifty years ago, anticipated some of the conclusions which I have reached by a toilsome but independent route. As his article has been strangely overlooked by many scholars, I venture to quote its salient portions here:—

> Bachiarius, a monk of the early part of the fifth century, the author of two short treatises. . . . Gennadius attributes to him several works, only one of which he acknowledges to have read, viz., the *Libellus de fide Apologeticus*, addressed to the Bishop of Rome. Gennadius's perusal of this work must have been careless, for he entirely mistakes its object, which was not, as he states, to 'defend himself against those who condemned him for leaving his country and adopting a migratory life' ('querulos et infamatores peregrinationis suae'), of which there is not a word in the *Libellus*, but to satisfy the Bishop of Rome of his orthodoxy, who regarded him with suspicion on account of his being a native of a country tainted with heresy, and required a confession of his faith. What this country was there is nothing in the *Libellus* to determine. Galland argues in favour of Spain, which at that time was infested with the Priscillianist and Origenistic errors. Bachiarius affirms that he had left his native country because of its heresy (*Lib.*, § 1), and claims to be regarded as a native not of the land of his birth but of his baptism (ibid. § 2). Bachiarius's profession of faith is thoroughly orthodox in all leading points. Its date is fixed approximately at about the middle of the fifth century, by his denial of the tenets of Origen regarding the soul and the resurrection-life, and those of Helvidius on the perpetual virginity of the Virgin (§ 3, 4), and by his omission of the Son when speaking of the procession of the Holy Ghost. . . . Bachiarius has very strangely been confounded by Cave, Bale, and others with Mochta, a disciple of St. Patrick.[1]

In this otherwise excellent article there are some points which need comment and correction. Bachiarius flourished in the early part of the fifth century; we have seen that his Confession was written between 400 and 412 or 415. Whether he was a monk or a bishop, or both together, nobody knows for certain. It is very curious that, in his Confession, he seems to be again and again on the point

[1] *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, art. 'Bachiarius.'

of disclosing the name of his country; but each time, for some occult reason, he evades the question, and baffles our curiosity. Reading his Confession once more, after the lapse of two or three months, I am free to acknowledge that he does seem to admit that his country was tainted with heresy. But, unless I quite mistake his meaning, the phrases in which he seems to recognize his country's guilt are not the expression of his own views; they represent merely the prejudices and insinuations of his adversaries. In other words, he is writing argumentatively; his seeming admissions are of the *dato sed non concesso* order. The position he takes is that, even if his native land were as heretical as his opponents alleged, they would still be unjust in imputing heresy to himself. He urges this thesis with a wealth of ingenious illustration, and then, by way of climax, declares that his antagonists are maligning the whole people of a province for the sin of one man. Rome herself, that most blessed disciple of Peter, could not afford to be judged by so unfair a standard; for two, three, or more heresies have already issued from Rome, though not one of them has been able to lay hold of, or to move, the Chair of Peter, which is the Seat of Faith.[1]

In point of fact, Archdeacon Venables goes much too far when he says that 'Bachiarius affirms that he had left his native land because of its heresy,' for Bachiarius nowhere affirms anything of the kind. He 'claims to be regarded as a native, not of the land of his birth,' but of the *Civitas Dei* of which he has become a freeman by baptism. It is interesting to note that St. Augustine's noble work, *De Civitate Dei*, was begun in 413.

We have seen the reasons for ascribing the Confession of Bachiarius to the first twelve or fifteen years of the fifth century. Archdeacon Venables dates it 'approximately at about the middle of the fifth century,' on the vague and unsatisfactory ground of its 'omission of the Son when speaking of the procession of the Holy Ghost.'

[1] Migne, *P.L.*, xx. 1023.

But the Filioque did not become a bone of contention for four centuries after Bachiarius' time. Indeed, the Filioque hardly ever gave rise to serious controversy in Latin Christendom; and, apart from a few sporadic denials and discussions, it became an issue of grave importance only when rejected by Photius of Constantinople in 858. On the other hand, Pelagianism was a burning question in the Western Church from 411 or 412, or 415 onwards. The fact that Bachiarius never alludes to Pelagianism in his Confession of Faith is a proof that he wrote before Pelagianism had become a living issue; he could have written at any time before the ninth or tenth century—that is, before the Greek Schism—without feeling obliged to mention the Filioque.

Archdeacon Venables is on solid ground when he observes that 'Bachiarius has very strangely been confounded by Cave, Bale, and others with Mochta, a disciple of St. Patrick.' Bale, whose well-known work on British writers appeared in 1557-1559, was the prime architect of this confusion; Cave (1637-1713) was merely one of his numerous followers. Dr. Reginald Lane Poole, late editor of the *English Historical Review*, has published Bale's notebook, under the title of *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, Oxford, 1902. 'It is seldom, for instance, that Bale here displays that virulent scurrility which has given him a bad name among controversialists of the baser sort,' remarks the learned editor in his Preface.

The Basle edition of 1557-59 was only the complete and final issue of Bale's work. This edition was the one that became commonly known to scholars, and that influenced their views for centuries afterwards. A part of Bale's work first saw the light in England; his first published catalogue is entitled, *Illustrium maioris Britanniae Scriptorum Summarium*,' and bears on f. 248 the imprint of Ipswich and the date, 31 July, 1548. A re-issue of the same sheets with a changed title-page is dated at Wesel, 1 August, 1549. The second and enlarged edition is the *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae Catalogus*, published

in two parts (usually bound in one volume) at Basle in September, 1557, and February, 1559.[1]

Bale's notebook shows that he followed some unnamed authority, perhaps more than one, in identifying Bachiarius with St. Mochta. The authorities named by Bale, in his notes on this topic, are Gennadius, Boston of Bury, and Walter of St. Alban's. We already know what Gennadius has left on record concerning Bachiarius; of St. Mochta he knew nothing at all. John Boston of Bury, who flourished about 1410, says nothing whatever about St. Mochta, but gives this brief notice of Bachiarius: 'Bacharius floruit circa A.C. . . . et scripsit, juxta Cathalogum librorum Angliae et juxta Gennadium, De reparatione lapsi et fructu poenitentiae, lib. 1. Pr[incipium]: *Nisi vererer.* Fin[is]: *intervenire.* De fide, lib. 1.'[2]

To this notice, Boston of Bury appends certain figures, indicating that copies of the writings of Bachiarius were to be found in his time in the libraries of Bury St. Edmunds, Ramsey, or Reading. This notice, as we shall see, is copied and corrupted by Bale. What the Catalogue of English Books was, on which Boston relied, I have been unable to discover.

From Bale's notebook we learn what Walter of St. Alban's wrote about Bachiarius—he was as silent as Boston of Bury in regard to St. Mochta: 'Bachiarius (ut fertur) Britanus, vir eloquentissimus, scripsit ad Januarium de reparatione lapsi, et fructu penitentie, li. 1. "Nisi vererer beatissime frater,"' etc.[3]

We can now see the manner in which Bale dealt with his authorities. Let me repeat that his three authorities in this matter were Gennadius, Boston of Bury, and Walter of St. Alban's, and that none of the three says a word about St. Mochta. Nevertheless, Bale writes in his notebook:—

Macceus vates, quem alii Bacciarium, alii Bachianum vocant, floruit

[1] Dr. R. L. Poole, *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, Preface.
[2] Tanner, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, 1748, praef., p. xxix.
[3] *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, 285.

circa annum Christi 460, et scripsit, juxta Catalogum librorum Angliae, ac juxta Gennadium :

De reparatione lapsi, lib. 1.

De fructu poenitentiae, lib. 1, 'Nisi vererer.'

De fide perseverante, lib. 1.

Atque alia quaedam.

Hic vacare Deo disponens, elegit peregrinationem pro servanda castitate, secundum Gennadium. Praefatum opus habebatur Ramesiae ac Buriae in bibliothecis.—*Ex Bostoni Buriensis Catalogo.*[1]

Bale makes up his inflated list of Bachiarius' writings by reckoning the 'De reparatione lapsi' twice over, and adding 'atque alia quaedam' out of his own head. His main authority is obviously Boston of Bury, whom he misunderstands, and whose careful accuracy he was unwilling to imitate. Now, since Bale derives no support for his 'Macceus vates' from Gennadius, Boston of Bury, or Walter of St. Alban's, where did he get the idea that Mochta and Bachiarius were one and the same? No light is thrown on this question by Bale's lengthy notice of Bachiarius in his work on British Writers. That notice is, indeed, an extraordinary medley of errors. Some facts are borrowed from St. Mochta's life; these facts, misunderstood and distorted, are mingled with the errors of Gennadius concerning Bachiarius, and with various gleanings from Boston and Walter of St. Alban's; the mixture is served up with a seasoning of contemporary history, for which Gildas, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and Bede are held responsible :—

Bachiarius Macceus, divi Patricii discipulus, natione Brytannus (alii Macceum vatem appellant) post varia bonarum artium in Legionensi [2] gymnasio studia, Mathematicis disciplinis aetate juvenili se totum impendit, perveniens demum ad annos provectiores, per philosophiam Christianam nudus et expeditus Deo vacare disponens, longam peregrinationem pro concepta integritate conservanda suscepit. Inaudita enim illis diebus tyrannide (ut in historiis docent Gildas, Galfridus et Bedas) Hunni, Picti et Scoti, Brytannos per Maximum regem attenuatos opprimebant; et ob id aufugisse Bachiarium ex patria suspicabantur quidam. Sed edito tandum libello, Romanae urbis pontifici Leoni, ut fertur, satisfecit, adversus querulos suae peregrinationis infamatores.

[1] *Index Brit. Script.* 285.

[2] I suspect he means Leinster (Laigin in Middle Irish). Others understand Leon in Spain.

Seque demonstrabat non hominum timore, sed Dei causa illam suscepisse: ut exiens de terra et cognatione sua, cohaeres fieret Abrahae patriarchae. Composuit vir eloquentissimus ad Januariam de reparatione lapsi, alias

De fructu poenitentiae, Lib. 1. Nisi vererer, beatissime frater.

De fide perseverante, Lib. 1.

Prognostica nativitatum, Lib. 1.

Caetera non sunt a Gennadio, Honorio, aut Capgravo catalogis inscripta. Ultimum edidit librum, dum juvenis incumberet Mathesi. Claruit senex anno virginei partus 460, Vortigerio in Brytannia regnante. Hunc alii Bacciarium, alii Bachianum vocant.[1]

This passage was a masterpiece of inextricable confusion, and it led writers astray for centuries after Bale's time. Notwithstanding his diffuseness, Bale is persistently silent on the question that mainly concerns us here. What was his authority for identifying Bachiarius with St. Mochta? To this question, he gives no hint of a reply. Nevertheless, I believe that he had some authority; that he was not exactly the original inventor of the error, though he was its greatest propagandist. The entry in his private notebook, coupled with the explicit statement in his printed work, affords sufficient evidence that he had, somewhere or other, found some sort of authority for the identification.

The Dictionary of National Biography reminds us that Bale's work 'deserves independent consideration, as it was founded on an examination of manuscripts in monastic libraries, many of which have since been lost.'[2] I strongly suspect that it was in some old manuscript, in some English monastic library, that Bale found his unnamed authority for identifying Bachiarius with St. Mochta. This suspicion is by no means far-fetched. In the public library of Bamberg is a twelfth-century manuscript of one of the opuscula of Bachiarius; it is entitled, 'Bachiarii B. natione Hyberni, S. Patritii discipuli, anno 445, Epistola ad Januarium de Recipiendis Lapsis.'[3]

This, of course, does not prove that Bachiarius was an

[1] Bale, *Scriptorum Illustrium Majoris Brytanniae . . . Catalogus*, Basle edit., pp. 44, 45.

[2] *D.N.B.*, iii. 42.

[3] C. P. Cooper, *Appendix*, p. 14.

Irishman; for the headings of manuscripts are notoriously illusory in a multitude of cases. Side by side with the Bachiarius manuscript in this library of Bamberg, and side by side with it on the same page of Cooper's *Appendix*, is another manuscript which bears the palpably false title, 'S. Patritii Episcopi in Hibernia constituti, circa a. 430, Liber de Purgatorio.' A glance through any standard work on patrology, such as Bardenhewer's *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Litteratur*, will show how astonishingly frequent were these false ascriptions in manuscripts of the early Christian ages. Batiffol fills nearly five pages with a bare list of titles of pseudepigrapha ascribed to Greek Fathers of the first four centuries, and the list is admittedly far from complete.[1] In these circumstances, we can hardly be surprised at the blunders of authors or scribes, who write down Bachiarius as a Briton, an Irishman, and a disciple of St. Patrick, as we have seen them do. The next step, and a very natural one, was to identify him with St. Mochta the Briton, who became a disciple of St. Patrick, and spent the greater part of his long and holy life in Ireland.

Recent scholars are fairly agreed that Bachiarius and St. Mochta were quite distinct personages. They may have been contemporaries; if so, Bachiarius was much the older of the two. His Confession of Faith was written, apparently, before 415, which we may regard as the earliest possible date of St. Mochta's birth. The Confession was probably written before Mochta was born; it was certainly written long before he became a Christian.

There is no ultimate authority save that of Bale, for identifying one with the other, and Bale's authority is a broken reed. He may have found Bachiarius identified with St. Mochta in the false heading of some manuscript which has since perished; or, more likely still, he may have inferred from some manuscript, similar to the one at Bamberg, that Bachiarius, the alleged 'disciple of St. Patrick,' was identical with St. Mochta. The whole case

[1] Batiffol, *Litterature Grecque*, 1898, pp. 327-331.

for the identification rests on Bale, and Bale rests on a blunder.

Pelagianism was the only heresy of which Irishmen were accused or suspected; and the theory that St. Mochta wrote the Confession to defend himself and his countrymen against suspicions on that score is palpably at variance with internal evidence. The Confession, as we have seen, does not contain the least allusion to Pelagian error; on the contrary, it is mainly directed against Priscillianism. If Bachiarius were an Irishman, he would have been defending the Irish—some twenty years or more before the coming of St. Patrick—against the suspicion of Priscillianism, a heresy of which they were never at any time suspected.

The real identity of Bachiarius is still wrapped in mystery. There is a growing tendency among scholars to regard him as a Spaniard. His name does not occur in the lists of Spanish and Portuguese bishops published by Gams in his *Series Episcoporum*; but these lists, so far as the fourth and fifth centuries are concerned, are of a rather fragmentary character. Somewhere between 656 and 682, however, Gams places 'Bracarius, scriptor ecclesiasticus' as Bishop of Seville,[1] as Florez had done long before.

No ecclesiastical writer, adorned with such a name as Bracarius, figures in books of reference by modern scholars. We seek in vain for such a name in *The Dictionary of Christian Biography*, in Chevalier's exhaustive and wonderful *Répertoire Bio-Bibliogr. des Sources Historiques du Moyen Âge*, in the *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, and other standard works of reference. Chevalier, indeed, boldly sets down Bachiarius as a Spaniard, and a theologian of the Latin Church, who flourished about the year 400; moreover, he furnishes detailed references to seventeen or eighteen works of various kinds from which information respecting Bachiarius may be gleaned.

There is just a possibility that Gams, though deplorably wrong as to dates and spelling, may have hit upon an

[1] *Series Episcoporum*, 72.

important truth, namely, that Bachiarius, the ecclesiastical writer, was Bishop of Seville. If we could be sure of this, it would explain many things. As a Spaniard, whether bishop or simple monk, Bachiarius would naturally be suspected by the Roman authorities of Priscillianism, which was the national heresy. Baetica, the southern province whose capital was Seville, was relatively immune from the contagion, while Gallaecia, in the far north-west, was the redoubtable stronghold of Priscillianism. The one prominent Priscillianist sprung from Baetica was Tiberianus, who wrote a bombastic Apology in his own defence, and was banished to the Scilly Isles in A.D. 386.[1] The bishops of Baetica were men of such rigid orthodoxy that they would no longer communicate with the other Spanish bishops, simply because the latter had accepted the recantation of Symphosius, Dictinius, and other Bishops of Gallaecia, who had abjured Priscillianism at the Synod of Toledo in 400, and because these penitent prelates had been restored to their sees. Pope Innocent I, in 402, found it necessary to reprove the intolerant zeal of the Baetican bishops.[2]

All this would account for the indignation of Bachiarius on finding that the people of his native province were in ill repute through the fault of one man. All that he says about his *patria* and his *provincia* would fit readily into the picture. Being a Spaniard, his faith was open to suspicion; being unflinchingly orthodox, it was but natural that he should warmly resent such an imputation. We might even imagine, though without the slightest positive ground for doing so, that the skill and orthodoxy of his Confession of Faith were rewarded by his promotion to the see of Seville.

But there are grave difficulties against this whole theory. Florez, in his *España Sagrada*, stoutly maintains that Bachiarius and Bracarius were different persons, though both were Spaniards. He prints two lists of the Bishops

[1] St. Jerome, *De Viris Illust.*, c. 123; Künstle, *Antipriscilliana*, 160; *Dict. of Christian Biog.*, s.v. Tiberianus.

[2] Migne, *P.L.*, xx. 486-489.

of Seville prior to 850. The first, which contains the name of Bracarius, is drawn from the *Codex Emilianensis*, a Gothic manuscript of the year 1000, now in the Escorial. The second purports to be taken from the cathedral archives of Seville. These lists, though agreeing in a rough, general way, do not inspire much confidence. Gams rejects 18 out of 43 names that appear on the first list; and this, in turn, omits six names which appear in the second. The names of Crispin and Bracarius, which figure in the first list, are omitted from the second; and there are minor differences too numerous to mention. After the invasions and ravages suffered by Spain from the year 400 to the year 1000, it is scarcely likely that an obscure Gothic writer of the latter date should be able to compile a correct list of the Bishops of Seville from apostolic times, and to place them in their proper order. In point of fact, he omits St. Gerontius who was Bishop of Italica, only four miles from Seville, in the apostolic age.

Bracarius figures as the 28th Bishop of Seville in the first list, while Gams assigns him the 15th place, and the second list omits him altogether. It is possible that the first list may be quite correct as to the spelling of Bracarius' name, and as to his place in the succession—neither list gives a single date. But when we find such names as Diocletus, Geminus, and Glaucus in one list transformed into Diodatus, Gentinus, and Claucius in the other, we can hardly be blamed for suspecting that Bachiarius may have been transmuted into Bracarius.

Lopez frankly admits that these lists of Seville's bishops have been interpolated; that the second list improperly inserts two Bishops between Epiphanius and Sabinus; that the same list adds a string of other names for which there is neither room nor authority; and, finally, that the first list has been vitiated by scribal errors.[1]

Hence we cannot place implicit reliance either on the form of Bracarius' name in the first list, or on the place which it assigns him in the succession. Indeed, it is plain

[1] Lopez, *España Sagrada*, 1752, vol. ix. pp. 126-223.

that Lopez is merely guessing when he assigns Bracarius to some date between 656 and 682. The first list, however, is corroborated by John of Seville (fl. *circa* 839), who speaks of Bracarius as Bishop of Seville, and quotes a passage from one of his doctrinal writings, but supplies no information as to the period in which he lived. The passage in question treats of the origin of the human soul,[1] and seems much more likely to have been written in the early part of the fifth century than in the latter half of the seventh. In a word, it might very well have been written by Bachiarius, if he were Bishop of Seville in the days of St. Augustine and St. Jerome.

As the extract is brief and not readily accessible, I may reprint it here:—

> Animas hominum non esse ab initio inter ceteras intellectuales naturas, nec in simul creatas, sicut Origenes fingit; neque cum corporibus per coitum seminantur, sicut Luciferiani et Cyrillus et multi Latinorum præsumptores adfirmant, quasi natura consequentia serviente; sed dicimus corpus totum per conjugii copulam germinari, Dei vero judicio coagulari in vulva, et configi, atque formari; et formato jam corpore animam creari et infundi, ut vivat in utero homo ex anima constans et corpore, et egrediatur vivus ex utero plenus humanâ substantiâ.[2]

This passage, I submit, is much more likely to have been written in 400-415—when Origen's errors, lately made known by Rufinus, were being fiercely resented and opposed—than in 656-682, when the controversy had long been stale and dead. The writer, it will be noted, speaks of Origen and the Luciferians in the present tense. Now, Lucifer of Cagliari died in 371, and his followers were a dwindling and dying sect in 400-415; in fact, the Luciferian schism seems hardly to have outlasted the generation which followed the death of its originator. A writer of 656-682, two centuries and a half later, would be very unlikely to speak of the Luciferians in terms which implied that they still existed, or that their opinions were still dangerous.

The passage above cited harmonizes admirably with the

[1] Quoted in Lopez, ibid., ix. 222.

[2] Lopez, ibid.

known attitude of Bachiarius towards the question of the soul's origin. In this passage we seem to catch an echo of the confident, off-hand tone in which he had disposed of the question in his Confession of Faith. The doctrine in both cases is fundamentally the same, with this difference, that it is much more precise and detailed, as well as fuller and more developed, in the extract than in the Confession.[1] The origin of the human soul was a topic keenly debated in the first quarter of the fifth century; St. Augustine, St. Jerome, Rufinus, Bachiarius, and many another took a share in the discussion; but we have no evidence to show that the question gave rise to earnest debate in the second half of the seventh century.

All these indications lead me to suspect that Bachiarius was the author of the passage we are considering, and that Bachiarius was identical with Bracarius, Bishop of Seville. That the name should have been corrupted into Bracarius, after four centuries of barbarian pillage and barbarian domination, is nowise surprising. We have seen that the name of Bachiarius appears as Bacharius in two important French codices, as well as in Boston of Bury; and it is similarly written in two codices of the Bodleian Library. Gesner writes the name as Baccharius, and his editors transform it into Barcharius. Such a name would be easily and naturally transmuted into Bracarius, especially in the Spanish peninsula, where Braga was a city of great civil and ecclesiastical importance, and where Bracara and Bracarensis, the Latin noun and adjective which stood for Braga, were words in daily use. As Canon Bardsley and Father Woulfe[2] have pointed out, there is a law of attraction or assimilation which operates in names. A name of comparatively rare occurrence—such as Bachiarius—is often assimilated to some better known name—such as Bracara or Bracarensis in the present instance.

If I am right in identifying Bracarius with Bachiarius,

[1] Compare the extract given above with par. 4 of the Fides Bachiarii in Migne, *P.L.*, xx. 1030.

[2] Woulfe, *Irish Names and Surnames*, 37, 38.

the passage above quoted will figure as part of a third opusculum of that writer, the first two being the *Fides* and the *De Reparatione Lapsi*. If the very interesting and plausible theory, which identifies Bachiarius with 'the holy bishop Peregrinus,' should prove to be true—and the facts seem to be wholly in its favour—we shall have to credit Bachiarius with other literary activities of a memorable kind. According to this theory, Bachiarius concealed his identity behind the modest pseudonym of 'Peregrinus'; and 'Peregrinus' is believed to have been the editor of an orthodox recension of the Vulgate, as well as the author of a Catholic redaction of the Canons of Priscillian.[1] Many difficulties vanish when we accept the view that Bachiarius, at first a simple monk, was raised to the bishopric of Seville; that he was a holy and learned prelate, a lover of Holy Scripture, and a staunch adversary of Priscillianism; that he loved to describe himself at times as one who had forsaken his earthly fatherland, and who was an exile from his true home in Heaven; and that his name was corrupted into Bracarius by the ignorance of later ages.

[1] Berger, *Hist. de la Vulgate*, 1893, p. 28; *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, i. 448, ii. 1403.—The authorship of a Bodleian tract, now preserved in MS. Bodley, 633, has been falsely ascribed to Bachiarius by Tanner (*Bibl. Brit.-Hib.* 62), Bernard (*Catalogi Libror. MSS.* 99), and Nich. Antonius (*Bibl. Hisp. Vetus*, 1788, vol. i. 234). The Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian kindly informs me that this, in fact, is Isidore's tract, *De Ordine creaturarum*. It figures as No. 1966 in Madan and Craster's recently published *Summary Catalogue of Western MSS. in the Bodleian Library*, vol. ii. pt. 1.

GTU Library
3 2400 00403 3761

DATE DUE

FEB 30 7283			
HNX	12/20/01		
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall.